The Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

283.05
CHUO
v.10

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/churchofenglandp1018unse

THE

Church of England Pulpit,

AND

Ecclesiastical Review.

JULY TO DECEMBER, 1880.

VOL. X.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE. 160, FLEET STREET, E.C.

28.305
CHU
V. 10

CONTENTS OF VOL. X.

SERMONS ON— Page

Commands to Believe and Love, by the Bishop of Oxford 313
Vitality of the Christian Faith, by Rev. W. Hay Sharp, M.A. 317
Daily Bread, by Rev. Edward Thring, M.A. 325
National Improvidence, by Rev. W. L. Blackley, M.A. 326
Christianity Inexplicable by Natural Causes, by Ven. Archdeacon Reichel, D.D. 337
St. Paul's Character, by Rev. H. E. Wetherall, B.A.... 344
Man in the Universe without God—Pessimism, by Very Rev. Edward Bickersteth, D.D.... 349
God's Care for the Helpless, by Rev. J. F. Bateman, M.A. 353
The Candle of the Lord, by Rev. Phillips Brooks ... 361
Continuous Life, by Rev. Edward Thring, M.A. ... 366
The Motive Power of Christ's Love, by Very Rev. Daniel Bagot, D.D. 373
A Door of Hope, by Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D.... ... 376
Results of Denying Intelligence in the Universe—Final Causes, by Rev. Canon E. T. Leeke, M.A. 385
The Reception of Bradlaugh into Parliament, by Rev. W. B. Philpot, M.A. 389, 397
Religion in Every-day Life, by Rev. J. Vaughan, B.A. 401
The Sympathy of Christ, by Very Rev. Dean Bagot, D.D. 409
The Reality of the Future Life, by Rev. Courtenay Moore, M.A. 411
The Light of the World, by Rev. W. J. Hall, M.A. ... 421
Holiness on the Bells of the Horses, by Rev. H. C. Mitchinson, M.A.... 423
Self-deception, by Rev. Henry G. Hird, B.A. 426
The Words of Christ, by Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ... 433
The Christian's Possession, by Rev. Canon Duckworth, D.D... 448
Pharisaism, by Rev. C. H. O. Daniel, M.A. 445
The Second is Like Unto It, by Rev. Joseph B. Mayor, M.A. 457
The Old Catholic Congress at Baden-Baden, 1880, by Rev. T. Archibald White, M.A. 461
The Use of Dogma in Religion, by Hon. and Rev. A. T. Lyttelton, M.A. 469
What is Wisdom, by Rev. Professor Salmon, D.D. ... 481
The Barren Fig Tree, by Rev. Arthur L. Lloyd, M.A.... 493
Harvest Thanksgiving, by Rev. C. B. Brigstocke, M.A. 496
The Transfiguration, by Rev. T. H. Stokoe, D.D. ... 505
The Great Authority, by Rev. W. B. Philpot, M.A. ... 508
Sobriety of Devotion, by the Bishop-Suffragan of Bedford 517
Saved by Hope, by Rev. W. Thompson, M.A. 519
The Reason of the Atonement, by the Bishop of Peterborough 529
The Rock, by Rev. Theophilus Campbell, D.D. ... 533
The Marching Orders of the Church of God, by Rev. James A. Carr, M.A., LL.D.... 541
Notes on the Pharisee, by Rev. C. W. Jones, M.A. ... 543
Early Devotion to God, by the Bishop-Suffragan of Nottingham 553
Stones Crying Out for the Church, by Ven. Archdeacon Buchanan, M.A. 555
Unprofitableness in Ireland, by Rev. Francis King, D.D. 565
Truth, by Rev. Edward Thring, M.A. 577
Atheism, by Rev. Reginald Molyneux, M.A. 578
The Bible Theory of Man's Unhappiness, by Bishop of Peterborough 589
The Triumphant Reign of Christ, by late Rev. W. Nixon Hooper, M.A. 594
The Once for all Delivered Faith, by Ven. Archdeacon Reichel, D.D. 601

SERMONS ON— Page

The Day of Small Things, by Rev. W. H. Hutchings... 613
Job's Pious Resignation, by Rev. H. Harris Davies ... 615

SERMONS BY—

Bishop of Peterborough—The Reason of the Atonement 529
Bishop of Peterborough—The Bible Theory of Man's Unhappiness 589
Bishop of Oxford—Commands to Believe and Love ... 313
Bishop-Suffragan of Bedford—Sobriety of Devotion .. 517
Bishop-Suffragan of Nottingham—Early Devotion to God 553
Dean of Lichfield—Man in the Universe Without God —Pessimism 349
Bagot, Very Rev. Dean—The Sympathy of Christ 409
Bagot, Very Rev. Dean—The Motive Power of Christ's Love... 373
Bateman, Rev. J. F.—God's Care for the Helpless ... 353
Blackley, Rev. W. L.—National Improvidence 326
Brigstocke, Rev. C. B.—Harvest Thanksgiving... ... 496
Brooks, Rev. Phillips—The Candle of the Lord... ... 361
Buchanan, Ven. Archdeacon—Stones Crying Out for the Church 555
Campbell, Rev. Theophilus—The Rock 533
Carr, Rev. James A.—The Marching Orders of the Church of God 541
Duckworth, Rev. Canon—The Christian's Possession ... 445
Daniel, Rev. C. H. O.—Pharisaism 448
Davies, Rev. H. Harris—Job's Pious Resignation ... 615
Hall, Rev. W. J.—The Light of the World 421
Hird, Rev. H. G.—Self-Deception 426
Hooper, Rev. W. Nixon—The Triumphant Reign of Christ 594
Hutchings, Rev. W. H.—The Day of Small Things ... 613
Jones, Rev. C. W.—Notes on the Pharisee 543
King, Rev. Francis—Unprofitableness in Ireland ... 565
Leeke, Rev. Canon—Results of Denying Intelligence in the Universe—Final Causes 385
Lloyd, Rev. Arthur L.—The Barren Fig Tree 493
Liddon, Rev. Canon—A Door of Hope 376
Liddon, Rev. Canon—The Words of Christ 433
Lyttelton, Rev. A. T.—The Use of Dogma in Religion 469
Mayor, Rev. Joseph B.—The Second is Like Unto It... 457
Mitchinson, Rev. H. C.—Holiness on the Bells of the Horses 423
Moore, Rev. Courtenay—The Reality of the Future Life 411
Molyneux, Rev. Reginald—Atheism 578
Reichel, Rev. Archdeacon—Christianity Inexplicable by Natural Causes... 337
Reichel, Rev. Archdeacon—The Once for All Delivered Faith 601
Philpot, Rev. William B.—The Reception of Bradlaugh into Parliament... ... ... 389, 397
Philpot, Rev. William B.—The Great Authority .. 508
Salmon, Rev. Professor—What is Wisdom 481
Sharp, Rev. W. Hey—Vitality of the Christian Faith... 317
Stokoe, Rev. T. H.—The Transfiguration 505
Thompson, Rev. W.—Saved by Hope 519
Thring, Rev. Edward—Daily Bread 325
Thring, Rev. Edward—Continuous Life... 366
Thring, Rev. Edward—Truth 577
Vaughan, Rev. J.—Religion in Every Day Life ... 401
White, Rev. T. Archibald—The Old Catholic Congress at Baden-Baden, 1880... 461
Wetherall, Rev. H. E.—St. Paul's Character 344

988244

LEADING ARTICLES:

Good Fools, by M. A. M. 320
The Burials Bill 330
Archdeacon Reichel on M. Renan 345
Clerical Restrictions at the Universities 346
The Dean of Lichfield on Pessimism 355
Continuous Life 368
The Turks 368
Circumcision 403, 414, 428, 380
The Atonement.—No. II 428
Infant Baptism and Circumcision 438
The Church Congress 451
The Wordsworth Memorial Fund 463, 512, 559
State of Ireland 485
The Leicester Church Congress and its President ... 485
The Bishop of Peterborough on the Atonement ... 536
The Situation in Ireland 537, 559, 606
Clerical Wit 571
The Reign of Law 597
The Bishop of Lincoln on his Diocese 619

REVIEWS AND NOTICES—

The Christian, by Rev. Daniel Moore 323
W. and A. K. Johnston's Bible Atlas 324
Deep unto Deep, by the Rev. Sir E. Bayley, B.D. ... 332
The Threefold Sonship of Christ by Very Rev. Dean Bagot, D.D. 333
Questions of the Day, by Ven. J. A. Hessey, D.C.L.... 346
A Church of England Hymn Book, by Rev. Godfrey Thring, M.A. 357
Memorial Edition of the Oxford Bible for Teachers ... 394
The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures by Very Rev. Dean Bagot, D.D. 395
Hints to Preachers, by Canon L. Reynolds Hole ... 418
Studies in Genesis, by Rev. Stanley Leathes, D.D. ... 575
The Inspiration of the New Testament by Walter R. Browne, M.A. 611

POETRY—On Faith, by Very Rev. Dean Bagot, D.D. ... 431

PAPERS—

Infant Baptism Proved from Scripture by Rev. R. Galbraith, M.A. 439
Teaching in Sunday Schools 466
Coercion of Turkey 454
The Wordsworth Memorial 463, 492
Bishop of Lincoln on the Burials Act 478
Bishop of Durham at his Diocesan Conference ... 474, 480
Internal Unity of the Church, by the Earl of Carnarvon 486
" " Bishop of Durham 502, 513
" " Canon Farrar, D.D. ... 501
Bishop Bedell, by Rev. Courtenay Moore 489
" " by Rt. Hon. Joseph Napier, LLD. ... 550
Internal Organization of the Church, by Dean of Lichfield 498
Is there a Prayer for the Departed in the Anglican Communion Office, by Rev. Courtenay Moore ... 522
The Communion of Saints: How it may be Strengthened and manifested by Professor Wescott, D.D. ... 523
" " Rev. J. Llewellyn Davies ... 537
On the Present Condition and Prospects of the Church of England by Canon Meade, M.A.... 545
Positive Philosophy; its Social and Moral Tendencies, " " by the Archbishop of York 547
" " Rev. Brownlow Maitland.. 560
Work and Play, by Rev. C. H. Grundy 549
The Deity of Christ proved from John xiv. 28—" . . . My Father is greater than I." 562
The Expression of the Emotions by Language, by Professor C. F. Plumptre 562
The Clergy and Young Men, by Rev. C. H. Grundy ... 568
The Art of Reading and Speaking, by Rev. J. P. Sandlands, M.A. 572, 583, 598
Outline of Subjects for Private Prayer on Certain Days of the Week, by Rev. Courtenay Moore 582
Some Rule of Life, by a Country Vicar 598
Broad Church or No Church, by Rev. W. Smith 606, 619
Bishop of Lincoln's Pastoral Letter 622
Christless Optimism, by the Bishop of Meath (Lord Plunket) 621

CORRESPONDENCE—

The Laity and the Burials Bill 321, 331
The Burials Bill 322, 331, 441
The Order of St. Michael and St. George 323

CORRESPONDENCE—

Good Fools 331, 332, 346
Bradlaugh's Reception into Parliament 358
Dr. Pusey and Canon Farrar 368
The Turks 369
Circumcision 381, 404, 416, 429, 441, 452
Indifferentism and Scepticism 381
Continuous Life 396, 405
Teetotalism 405, 417
Christian Evidence Society 405
The Lord's Day Observance 415, 430
Address of Thanks to the Bishop of Lincoln 416
Parental Influence 418
A Bishop to Supervise Continental Chaplaincies 427, 432
Testimonial to the Bishop of Lincoln 430, 442, 452, 464
479, 491, 514, 522
Biblical Revision 453
The Seventeenth Centenary of the Episcopate in England 453
The Clergy and the Burials Act 465
Education in Turkey 465
Bishopric of Southwell Endowment Fund 479
Burials in France 514
The New Bye Laws for Schools 523
Testimonial to Bishop Ryle 539
Baptism 551, 561, 574, 609
The Wordsworth and Southwell Bishopric Funds ... 561
The Deity of Christ ... ... 573, 586-7 ... 600
Archdeacon Buchanan's Sermon 574
Bishop of Peterborough on the Atonement 584-6, 599, 609
Banns 610
Endowed Sermons 610

MISCELLANEOUS—

Elementary Education Bill, 1880 332
Sequestration of Mr. Mackonochie's Living 335
Enthronement, &c., of Bishop Ryle 336
Bishop Ryle's Autobiography and Preferments... ... 348
St. Peter's, Bournemouth 355, 382, 420
Choral Festivals at Lichfield, Durham, and Portland ... 359
Memorial from Middlesex for Reform of Convocation ... 359
The Origin of Convocation... 360
Bishop Piers Claughton on the Burial Bill 360
Archdeacon Reichel 369
Grants for Sunday-schools and Mission-rooms by S.P.C.K. 372
Oakham School Speech-Day 383
Oxford Diocesan Conference 384
Bishop of Lincoln on the Burials Bill 405
The Rev. Henry Wright's Death 407
The Bishop's Hostel for the Scholæ Cancellarii Lincoln 419
Dean of Ripon on the Church Congress 431
Archbishop of Canterbury on the Church 442
The Rev. J. Bell Cox and the Bishop of Liverpool ... 443
The Bishop of Carlisle on the Church 444
The Rev. W. J. Butler's Appointment as Canon of Worcester 444
The Rector of Clewer and the Sisters of Mercy... ... 455
Bishop of Liverpool on the Church 455
Rev. Bryan King's Protest against the Burials Act ... 456
Earl Granville on Church Extension 456
Rev. Stopford Brooke's Secession 467
Arrangements for Leicester Church Congress 467
Free and Open Church Association Meeting 468
The Rev. Thomas Boys 468
Sabbath Keeping Two Hundred and Fifty Years Ago... 480
Chancellor Tisdall D.D. on the Harvest in Ireland ... 480
Bishop of Asaph's Charge 491
Presentation to Archdeacon Harrison 504
The Guild of St. Luke 516
The Bishop of Meath on the Free and Open Church Movement 516
Bishop of Manchester on the Bible Society 527
Dublin Diocesan Synod on State of Ireland 540
Sermon to Commemorate Accession of Queen Elizabeth 563
Meeting to promote Memorial to Bishop of Lincoln 507, 610

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS...324, 336, 348, 360, 372, 384, 396, 420, 432, 444, 456, 468, 480, 492, 504, 516, 528, 540, 552, 564, 576, 588, 600, 612.

CLERICAL OBITUARY...324, 336, 348, 360, 372, 384, 396, 420, 432, 444, 456, 468, 480, 492, 504, 516, 528, 540, 552, 564, 576, 588, 600, 612.

THE

Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. X.—No. 236 SATURDAY, JULY 3, 1880. PRICE TWOPENCE.

The Church of England Pulpit.

COMMANDS TO BELIEVE AND LOVE.

BY THE BISHOP OF OXFORD.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD ON SUNDAY, JUNE 6TH, 1880.

"This is His commandment, that we should believe on the name of His Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as He gave us commandment."—1 JOHN iii. 23.

A COMMANDMENT to believe and love! Is there not—we are inclined to ask—some contradiction here? We understand the conviction that grows out of assent to a process of reasoning: we know the personal confidence which proved sincerity and high character inspire: we have had the happy experience of mutual affection, "When hearts are of each other sure." But the last thing we should expect would be to have these feelings and affections arise in us, as it were, by order—in obedience to a superior's command. Indeed, it is a matter of old experience in human life, that the very sound of a command is apt to banish the growing affection which it ignorantly tries to win. There is a natural waywardness in us, which makes us soon tire of what we are constrained to feel or do: the light and the shadow have vanished out of the prospect on which the eye is obliged all the day long to fix a steadfast gaze; the bird may be gently lured into captivity, but will never approach the snare when a harsh voice bids her come. In moral discipline, especially, who has not known instances of the exercise of a well-meant authority, which has had a life-long rebellion for its sad result? So we are perplexed, when we are told (as in the text) that it is God's command that we should believe and love.

But consider now, how this sense of inconsistency arises. Is it not from our persuasion that our affections and confidences are our own, and by their nature absolutely free? that they are such as a stranger cannot meddle with? that they are not ours, but his, if they are the creation of his will? that it is no longer we, who trust and love, when another has told us where our trust and love must be reposed? Within the limits of our freedom, surely this persuasion is just. Where we have the liberty to love or not to love, it is an outrage on our moral nature to try to take that liberty away. But then it is also true that nature puts some limits to this freedom. The moral constitution, which God has given us, is such that we *must* love goodness, unless indeed that constitution is altogether out of order, and diseased. The choice of our lovers and our friends is our own, so far at least as concerns the degree of inward affection we bestow on them: but it is no matter of choice for us whether we love the good and hate the evil, or the reverse. Faith in what we know to be false and mean is no faith in any real sense of the word: love for what is vile and base is but a mockery of love. Only, in our common experience, the false and the true, the noble and the base, are so confusedly intermixed, that we have seldom presented to us that which completely answers to our heart's true desire. It is when we come into the presence of God that we find the undoubted object of all our deepest affection and trust. Here God's command and the voice of nature, rightly heard, are one. For the Divine presence is pure goodness: it is true no man hath seen it; "No man hath seen God at any time:" we believe in that good and merciful Father, Whom we have not seen: but then, as if to make this faith more easy to us, it is added, "The only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." And so the command in the text to believe in the Name of Jesus Christ is just God's revelation to us of Himself as the only object of loving faith. All He

bids us do is to "Come and see." There will be a day when "Every eye shall see Him." The eyes that turn away from Him now must needs look upon Him then. But the gracious command comes to us to look now. This if we will do, faith will follow. For faith is God's gift: and to every one who will but come near at His bidding, He will freely grant it. Our Lord did not first ask His disciples to believe in Him or to love Him: He only said "Follow me." As they followed, they learned unconsciously to believe and love. So it has ever been; God calls men to attend to the preaching of His kingdom; His blessed Son is evidently set forth; if men will but patiently look at Him, the Holy Spirit comes to those attentive hearts. Not by the force of an alien command, but by the working of the Spirit in the souls which He has quickened, springs into life the disciple's faith, the child's affectionate trust.

Well would it have been for mankind, if this had been always understood; if Christians had remembered that the only legitimate command to faith in Christ is the constraining power of Christ's life and death. To preach Jesus Christ truly, simply, earnestly, is to set in motion the force which takes men captive to His sway. Other kinds of commandment have been tried, alas! how often: prisons and tortures, arbitrary compulsion, mad zeal of persecutors, and the tyranny of kings. Such commands have wrought no living faith, have borne the stamp of no authority which conscience could allow, have added no true adherents to the Christian cause. It has not been, it never can be, thus that the Holy Spirit works. And if in any branch of the Christian Church, such compulsion has been employed, not once, nor twice, but through many ages, if it has been an avowed characteristic of its system, so far that community, it is plain, has not the mind of Christ.

But let us pass from the quality of the commandment in the text, to the connection between the things commanded, faith and love. Here, too, is something which has been a perplexity to many, especially in our own time. Mutual duties, brotherly obligations of man to man, they recognise; the world could not go on without them. Even the spirit of love, the spring of these duties, they own; though the sweet old name of charity, with its religion and its poetry, must give place to an uncouth title in philosophic talk. However, in some form or another, it is acknowledged that to love one another is a condition of human society; the cynic may jest about "good haters;" but it would be hard to persuade him to live in a community of them; nor, as far as I see, do the coldest advocates of pure selfishness, as a theory, carry their theory to its consistent result. They accept the offerings which unselfish charity brings to them, without so much as a saving protest against the motive of the gift.

So far, in substance, we all agree. It is about the source, and the sanctions, of brotherly love that we differ. The Apostle bids us "believe on the name of Jesus Christ, and love one another, as He gave us commandment." The love of our brother is tied to faith in Christ: the very mode and character of it are settled by His command. Unbelievers reply that they see no connection between the two branches of the text. They admit indeed that Christ has brought to light some principles of morals, and rules of conduct, which were never so declared before. They are fain to own that masters of moral science, and the world at large, owe a considerable debt to Christian teaching and practice. And they will carefully collect out of the Scriptures some valuable elements of a pure moral system,—not indeed as if they derived any additonal value from their place in those Scriptures, or from their Teacher's authority; but just because they fit in well to the systems which the compilers are building up.

But how will they commend these ethical systems to mankind? how secure their adoption and use? By demonstration of their truth, say their advocates. Let them show us then the converts they have won; surely the advertisements of morality without religious belief have been long enough before the world to have produced by this time some definite fruit. Men of intelligence, of great powers, and varied accomplishments, have taken this matter in hand: it is quite fair to ask, what have they done? These moral armaments ought not to be on paper only: it should be easy by this time to point to moral agencies in active work, to moral victories won. The sinners reclaimed by arguments for undogmatic ethics—where are they? The prodigals who have returned to sit at the feet of some wise lecturer on them,—who has seen them? what manner of prayer do they utter when they are yet "a great way off" from the able teacher's door? Or if it be urged that such practical success is no conclusive test of the value of the systems in question, let us ask, at least, whether the persons who uphold them have ever taken any serious pains to bring them under the notice of the outcast and the poor. Is it that they have an uncomfortable suspicion that their demonstrations would be thrown away on the very persons who seem most loudly to call for some reformatory care? Yet surely they ought not to assume this without some practical proof. These systems profess to set forth new truths concerning the life of man, his feelings, motives, hopes, desires. If they have indeed discoveries on these all-important subjects to announce, there is good reason for the evangelists to go forth on their glad errand with hearty zeal. How is it, then, that we never hear of missionary work inspired by this desire? Nay: we hear it maintained on the other hand, that such zeal is altogether fantastical, and unreasonable; that each person must look after himself, form his own opinions, and take the consequences of his own mistakes. Good Christians who long to see the power of genuine charity increased, who interest themselves in other men's welfare, and try to make the world around them

better than it is,— what language do they hear? They are told that all the trouble they are taking is a waste of time and energy, an interference with what does not really concern them. The old question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" is answered by a direct negative: we have nothing to do with our brother, they say. Or, if many shrink from so extreme a statement, yet they contend that they have done all that could be expected of them when they have refuted error, banished old superstitious notions, and brought to light clear principles of moral and metaphysical truth. If poor, wilful, ignorant persons do not notice their philosophy, or act as if they have never heard of it, on their own heads be the mischief; philosophy has done its part, and has no shortcoming to confess.

Still to us, dear brethren, the question returns— we cannot get rid of it—how are we to influence character, change hearts and lives, make men love one another? We cannot, some of us, look on unmoved at a world of strife and disturbance; angry voices jar upon our ears; lives made miserable by selfishness and vice are a distress to us; we cannot help asking ourselves whether nothing can be done for sufferers, even though they suffer by their own fault. And so we try to understand what power it is which, as a matter of fact, moves men to a course of moral rectitude. It is not enough for us to have an admirable ethical system, complete in all its parts—what will set it agoing, so to speak, in the sphere of human life and conduct? We want, not so much theories of morals, as moral men. We would welcome with all our hearts the promise of some blessed influence which would change the face of the world. We do not deprecate new ideas, or underrate their possible value; but when we ask for their fruit, there is sometimes but little comfort in the reply. Men have discussed them, criticised them, given them their meed of censure or of approval; opinions have been changed; literature has altered its tone; here a fashion has been introduced, there a habit or practice has become obsolete; but what is the great mass of mankind doing, feeling, ceasing to do or feel, otherwise than as they would have felt and acted, if the ideas had never been broached? In our own society—the society of such a place as this—we watch earnestly, anxiously, to see what power there is, which can bid the young man curb his roving desire, can check the utterance of a foul or unworthy wish, charm away the dark suggestion of unholy passion, and fill the fresh, youthful nature with all the generous enthusiasm of a noble, honest life.

Look, then, to a still earlier page of this life which you desire to mould. Watch the formation of childish character. The young child does not learn the rudiments of an ethical code; or, if he learns them, it is not here you expect to find the springs of his actions. It is a living presence that has chiefly, perhaps entirely, affected him; it is some person, near and dear to him, who has made him what he is. He learned, you say, that it was his duty to speak the truth, as a part of his general instruction in morals. It may be so; but it was when he saw his mother's saddened look, when he heard his father's grave rebuke, that he felt how grievous a fault it was to tell a lie. Day by day, as he grew in stature, there came to him gentle pleadings for right, or strong entreaties; commands which he dared not disobey, yet could scarce have told you why; remonstrances against his follies, which would have passed by unheeded but for the music of the voice that uttered them. And in yet later years, it may be, he was happy enough to come within the influence of some true-hearted teacher, whose intercourse with him kindled a new desire for well-doing, a higher sense of honour, a keener indignation against wrong. Would to God that this particular experience were universal — that I could appeal, to everyone who hears me, for some loving recollection of an honoured guide at the critical season of early manhood. Here in Oxford it was the hope and intention of those who reared our fair collegiate homes to provide that no student in them should live beyond the reach of such good counsel and guidance as he needed for his soul's health. If it is a matter of common experience now—whether it is so you must judge—that a youthful member of the University should pass through his years of residence in it and never hear one word of Christian sympathy, one kindly warning against spiritual dangers; if it is possible for him to be disheartened by the sense that no one cares for him, that no one would listen to his tale of sorrow for wrong-doing, or his longing for escape from its bitter consequences, surely there is something altogether amiss. Do not answer that we have an increase of knowledge. Light is no substitute for love: light without love is but a bewildering gleam in the darkness of a moral night. But there are some around me who have a happier experience, some who can tell now—as old recollections would enable me to tell—of loved and honoured counsellors, whether in authority, or contemporaries who shared our studies and our mirth, to whom we owed almost our very selves. I appeal to these for witness to the truth of what I say, that this personal influence was, beyond comparison, the most powerful element of all that determined the spirit and tone of our daily lives. You say that this is irrational, that we ought not to be at the beck and call of our associates: that it is nobler to be guided by pure reason, than by the persuasive influence even of the best of friends. But you do not consistently maintain that view. The child who refuses to obey you, until you have convinced him of the absolute reasonableness of your command, is not your favourite; you rather hold it to be a token of an ungenerous and ungenial temper, that he should put no trust in the wisdom with which your authority is exercised. You detest the perpetual iteration of a fretful "why?" you see in the ready obedience of a trustful character the promise of a nobler, happier life.

You will have seen already, brethren, with what purpose I am appealing to this testimony which human nature gives to the personal influences that chiefly determine the character of our lives. Does it not illustrate the larger truth, that the deepest and most powerful motive in our whole life and conduct is the fear and love of God? In the forefront of the commandments, which stand for a practical summary of the moral law, we are met by the solemn statement, "God spake these words, and said." There are arguments, powerful arguments, for each one of those commandments, founded on their reasonableness, their utility, their relation to the dictates of human conscience; but no word of all this is spoken. Only we hear "God spake these words, and said." And "The mount that burned with fire,"—the "blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and voice of words,"—what was all this solemnity of publication but an impressive enforcement of the truth that the dictates of morality are the voice of God? It is matter of simple fact, that when that voice has ceased to sound in human ears, the law has ceased to hold its rightful place in human hearts and lives. To pass from the wide generalities of history to what we have ourselves known and felt, it is a matter of fact also that the sense of God's presence—the inward feeling that He is near us, about our path, and about our bed, spying out all our ways—has been a deterrent from wrong, a provocative to all good, such as no mere statement of moral verities, on their own account, ever could, or did, supply. Therefore it is that men rely on the sanctity of oaths, and religious vows, that they have been wont to make the most solemn engagements of their lives in the courts of the Lord's House, that they call upon Him to witness their tender of national allegiance to earthly rulers, that their very salutations and tokens of friendship have some request for His benediction woven into their familiar form.

I do not deny that in old times this religious sanction of all moral law had in it something of terror. They who heard the voice of God on Sinai found it so terrible as to make them entreat "That the word should not be spoken to them any more." Yet even under the Old Dispensation there was quite another feeling too. All through the cxixth Psalm how tenderly the Psalmist dwells on his love for the law of God, because it is God's law. "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? Even by ruling himself after Thy word? With my whole heart have I sought Thee; let me not go wrong out of Thy commandments. Thy words have I hid within my heart, that I should not sin against Thee. Blessed art Thou, O Lord! O teach me Thy statutes. . . . I will talk of Thy commandments; and have respect unto Thy ways. My delight shall be in Thy statutes; and I will not forget Thy word." The law and the testimony are beautiful exceedingly in themselves; but they never present themselves to the Psalmist's mind in that abstract perfection; to him they are the object of reverent contemplation, of holy delight, of earnest observance, still for the same paramount reason, that they belong to God.

To us these tender expressions of loving attachment to the law of God are an anticipation of a complete escape from the terrors of Sinai. St. Paul dwells upon the condition of Christians in marked contrast to that earlier state. "Ye are not come unto the Mount that burned with fire . . . . but ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem . . . and to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant." As we stand in that blessed presence, and claim our right of entrance among "The innumerable company of angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect," what do we hear but such words as those of my text,—"This is His commandment, That we should believe on the name of His Son Jesus Christ, and love one another."

I am well persuaded, brethren,—and the more I think of it, the firmer does that persuasion become—that in the faith of Jesus Christ lies the sure ground of Christian morality, and the guarantee for its power over Christian hearts. I do not understand what that morality is, until I have thought upon His life: not until I have learned to love it in His Character, do I desire it for myself. When St. Peter can answer without misgiving the thrice-repeated question, "Lovest thou Me?" he is ready for a life of Christian duty, and (if need be) of suffering too. St. Paul has no need to recite rules of conduct, or to construct a system of behaviour: quite simply, very shortly he has this one thing to say, "To me to live is Christ." And when he would dwell on "The righteousness which is through the faith of Christ;" still all his thought and wish is "To know Christ, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made comformable unto His death." What wonders the knowledge of Him, and the contemplation of His sufferings, have wrought! At this moment some peasants among the mountains far away are setting forth, in their poor fashion, the story of His death; and strangers from all Europe flock together to gaze upon the scene. What effect that sight may have on the thousands whom it draws together, I do not venture to guess, Sight is not faith; and it may be, that their gazing is more akin to sight than to faith; I cannot tell. But this is certain, that, so far as that, or any other, contemplation of the life and death of Christ brings men face to face with that Blessed One, in the spirit of an earnest desire to know Him—so far as that knowledge is the handmaid of a true faith in Him, so do men become in earnest His disciples, learners at His lips, followers of His steps, and imitators—alas! at how great a distance—of His perfect love. They have faith in Him, and love one to another for His sake. And are you wondering that so many do not believe in Him? Is there not at least as much cause for

wonder, that our own faith is so weak? We have learned by heart the inspired record of the beautiful life; we bow our heads instinctively when that Holy Name is named, we love the sight of His cross; year by year we keep the festivals that commemorate His acts of grace. Can it be that these things have become mere forms to us, relics of a faith that once was vigorous and true? God forbid. Yet something there is surely wanting in our faith; it needs to be animated with a new energy, if it is to have the effect, of which I have spoken, on our lives. To me, brethren, it seems that the very unbelief, which is seething around us, should have braced our souls, and awakened us to new energy by the demand on our service which it so earnestly makes. This is no time for languid assent to theological truths, for quiet enjoyment of the music to which we recite our creeds. Christ has work for us to do in His behalf. To make him known, to be very bold in confessing Him, to bring out in all their beauty His mercies and gifts, wherever men will let us speak of them; to trust wholly to His guidance, in spite of ridicule and contempt; day by day to try to live His hidden life, and more and more to feel the power of His death; to take Him into our very hearts with an adoring love; to long for His appearing, and even now to see him near; what sort of Christians are we, if these affections, these efforts, these longings, have no place within us? "Lord, we believe: help Thou our unbelief." So let us pray, and He will help us indeed. We shall not always have this poor, cold, hesitating faith; we shall not always be divided one from another by the contentions which ever multiply when faith is weak. Loving, trusting, believing, we shall kindle new hopes and energies in the whole company of believers; God will yet do great things for us: none greater than this, that He will teach us to love one another, as He gave us commandment, that is, even as He has loved us.

VITALITY OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

By the Rev. W. HEY SHARP, M.A., Warden of St. Paul's College.

Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Andrew, Sydney.

"Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."—St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

THEY say sometimes that Christianity is dead, or at least is dying. They speak of the religion of Jesus Christ as of some effete superstition; some fond belief that has had its day and has done its work;—a day not perhaps without its charm and its brightness, a work not altogether without its use among the generations that are gone. They would persuade us that we are now at length no longer children; but that as grown men we should make haste to put away from us the things of childhood, and accept with becoming dignity the inheritance—more sober, perhaps, and more prosaic, but also more tangible and solid—of mature life. They would have us turn our backs upon the gloom and the obscurity of theology and metaphysics, and worship with due enthusiasm the rising sun of positive knowledge. They look forward hopefully to the coming of a time when the last enemy shall be destroyed; but in *their* mouths the last enemy does not mean, as it means in the mouth of the Apostle, Death, and the fear of death; it means only man's belief in his own personal immortality. From many sides and in many voices we hear the doom of our Faith. The tones indeed are discordant, though the cry may be essentially the same. One assailant is eager and enthusiastic as he heralds the emancipation of the human intellect from the servitude of creed and Bible; another sneers cynically at the foolishness of religious minds; another condescends to patronise; another, with a more "engaging scepticism," parts reluctantly and sadly from the beliefs of other and happier days, which he deems to be inconsistent with his later and fuller enlightenment.

Unbelief is not one thing, but many. It is of many kinds, and has many causes. It comes at times from the genuine perplexity and bewilderment of a mind that is honestly in quest of Truth, but seems to itself to have no sure ground to tread, no trustworthy guide to follow. But now and then its genesis—we can hardly doubt—is less respectable than this. There is, for instance, room for the workings of a subtle vanity, which may find attraction in the name and fame to be gained from the exhibition of a clever power of destructive criticism, while no such flattering recognition awaits the defenders of the ancient faith. There *may*, too, in some cases, be a business aspect of such works as these, and although it would be rash and wrong to judge with haste the motives of this or that special book, yet for those who seek to measure for themselves the true proportions of the danger by which their Faith seems threatened, it cannot be amiss to take account of other possibilities of human nature than the thirst for knowledge and the pure love of truth. And, without pursuing further the analysis of unbelief, we need scarcely say that *the scepticism of downright immoral men should have no weight with us at all. If we should be ready to believe, on the testimony of one born blind, that there is no such thing as light or colour, no sun, no moon, no stars; or if the deaf may convince us that there is no such thing as sound or harmony; then, too, we may accept the witness of the cruel or the vicious that there is no such thing as the love of God, or as the gift of the Spirit, or as the new creation in the image of Christ.*

We may be quite sure that, when we come to look closely at the enemy, we shall not find his forces so formidable as they seem. *There are some of his weapons which may strike and wound ourselves, but cannot touch our Creed. They may strike ourselves; for if the weaknesses of human nature are*

working in his camp, they are at work in ours too. Christian men and Christian Churches—like James and John, the sons of Thunder—have many a time not known or have forgotten "what spirit they are of;" they have shown bigotry and intolerance; they have persecuted; they have dogmatised unwarrantably; they have separated uncharitably. And what they have sown they must expect to reap; well for them if the lesson of a stern experience throw them back more humbly and more faithfully upon the simplicity of Christ. But in the meantime we must remember that the sins or the shortcomings, the "negligences and ignorances," of the faithful, leave quite untouched the reality of the facts upon which their faith depends. The one may be a fair target for the enemy; but the arrow which strikes home to the careless or disobedient straggler from the camp, will still glance harmlessly off from the shield of faith which covers the vigilant and loyal soldier.

Or again, when we measure the forces that are arrayed against us, and would reassure ourselves from the alarm with which at first sight they may inspire us, we shall do well to recollect that *the power of popular and eloquent expression, and the power of scientific reasoning are two things perfectly distinct and separable.* Here and there you may find the two associated in high degree; but the possession of the one faculty in great perfection by no means implies the possession, in equal perfection, of the other. The deepest thought, the most patient investigation, may hardly know how to express itself in terms which the uninitiated multitude shall understand. And yet, among the world of listeners and lookers-on, it is those who can popularize discoveries or speculations who gain the greatest weight. To the imagination of the people, the eloquence of an Aaron may outweigh the inspiration of a Moses. We could any of us mention at this moment some few names, which, in common language seem almost to stand for the science of the day, and which are also to a large extent identified in our minds with hostility to the religion of Jesus Christ. These are the eloquent spokesmen among students of science. And I believe that, merely from this cause, we are apt to yield them undue deference. I *believe that we are too ready to assume that, because they are so brilliant in speech, they must also be most perfect in knowledge. But it is certain that behind these men there is a band of others, less prominent because content to work and think and learn without aiming to be popular, but whose scientific attainments are, to say the very least, as great, and whose faith in God stands firm.* We disquiet ourselves to little purpose, if we fancy that the best authority of science is on the side of materialistic unbelief. I take advantage of a confirmation of this statement which has come under my notice since this was written. It was asserted last year, (see Prof. Flint's "Anti-theistic Theories," p. 484) by Mr. Froude, that the foremost scientific men have, as a body, gone over to the materialistic camp or the side of scepticism. The assertion "called forth from Professor Tait the unanswerable reply:" —"*When we ask of any* COMPETENT *authority, who were the 'advanced,' the 'best,' and the 'ablest' scientific thinkers of the immediate past, (in Britain), we cannot but receive for answer such names as Brewster, Faraday, Forbes, Graham, Rowan, Hamilton, Hershel, and Talbot. This must be the case, unless we use the word science in a perverted sense. Which of these great men gave up the idea that nature evidences a designing mind? But perhaps Mr. Froude refers to the advanced thinkers still happily alive among us. The names of the foremost among them are not far to seek. But unfortunately for his assertion, it is quite certain that Andrews, Joule, Clerk-Maxwell, Balfour Stewart, Stokes, William Thomson, and such like, have each and all of them, when the opportunity presented itself, spoken in a sense altogether different from that implied in Mr. Froude's article. Surely there are no truly scientific thinkers in Britain farther advanced than these.*"

Speaking from the effect of the book upon myself, I should surely recommend as a very wholesome and refreshing discipline to any who may feel oppressed by the weight of such names as Matthew Arnold, Tyndall, Huxley, Herbert Spencer, or J. S. Mill, the careful perusal of a work called "Philosophy without Assumptions," by the Rev. T. P. Kirkman, a Fellow of the Royal Society of London. The book is not particularly easy reading, but its freshness and vigour, its pungent and hard-hitting style of argument, its lively and merciless illustrations, enable the reader once more to breathe freely in spite of the antagonism of these overpowering names. Do not let me be supposed to make light of the intellectual interest which attaches to the thoughts and writings of men like these. They are excellent reading; thoughtful, polished, learned, suggestive. But still it is a comfort to be convinced that they are far from being infallible, and that in the things which most concern our peace and happiness, all is not lost because they have taken part, more or less pronounced, against the religion of Christ.

There is one tendency of the present numerous and violent attacks on Christianity which I think ought to be welcomed as a benefit. If anything can force us to look at the great question of the soul and God in a broad and comprehensive way, instead of in a spirit of quarrelsome minuteness and detailed dogmatism, it ought surely to be this strenuous denial of the very existence of God and of the soul. One would think that in the presence of a common and determined foe, the Christian Churches might compose or sink their minor differences, and feel once more their unity of inner life. I know not to what extent it may be so. There are those to whom the fierce denunciation of opposing errors seems almost to be the breath of life. There are those who can scarcely find it in their hearts to admit within the pale of Christian charity,

a variation from their own accepted type of religious thought and life. And yet, as St. Paul tells us, the Christian life is a "*new creation.*" And in the old creation what feature is more beautiful and more remarkable than its variety in unity? How wonderfully varied is the old creation of land and water, of plants and animals, of sky and stars! How fruitful it is in new forms, new adaptations, new methods, new results! And yet in the midst of all this variety it is one complex whole, orderly and regular, obedient to the rule of its Creator. And shall the new creation be a thing tamer and less interesting than the old? Shall the new creation be monotonous, while the old was richly varied? Shall the new be rigid, while the old was plastic? Shall the new present the stiffness, the correctness, the unyielding outline of a geometrical drawing, while the old was designed upon the vague and flowing lines, the soft and changeful contour of a country landscape? True, we Christians have "one Lord, one faith, one baptizm, one God and Father of all;" but though it be "the same Spirit," yet are there "diversities of gifts," and "differences of administrations;" a regenerative influence working out different results from the varying data of human imperfection; a manifold reflection of the many-sided grace of the one God. And, if we heed the teaching of St. Paul, we shall be at no loss to deal with such variety of detail. With him the supreme Christian virtue is that charity which is not ready to judge or careful to mark what is done amiss; but which can bear and forbear, can feel that "all things are lawful for it," yet abstain from that which is "not expedient," can be fully "persuaded in its own mind," and yet can sacrifice a liberty whose exercise is fraught with peril to the conscience of a brother Christian. It will be good for us if the dangers which threaten our faith from without, shall end in strengthening the bonds which unite us from within.

But, when we have discounted,—as we have a right to do—the seeming strength of our foe, and when we have recognized the benefit of closer unity and livelier faith which may be one result of his attacks, there still remains the need for an active defence of our citadel. There is the faith of the believer to be yet more assured; and the perplexity of the bewildered to be cleared up; and the doubts of the wavering to be set at rest; and, if it may be so, the unbelief of the sceptic to be overcome. After all allowance has been made for mistake or prejudice, there still remains enough of real difficulty to make us cautious in judgment, and modest in assertion. The old defences will not withstand the newer weapons of attack. But, happily, new defences are forthcoming. There is no fear lest the real needs of our time should not be met by champions worthy of their cause. Only let us recognize that it is here that the strain of battle really lies. The questions at issue concern something greater than modes of worship or shades of doctrine. Is there a living God, Creator of the universe and Father of mankind? Or is all that we see but the outcome of dead unfeeling force and matter? Is there a soul, immaterial, immortal? Or are we, after all, mere "cunning casts in clay?" Is there, in answer to man's needs and cravings, a manifestation of the Divine Word in human flesh, an indwelling of the Divine Spirit in human hearts? Or has there been in very truth, "neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded?"

It may be said, perhaps, that it is enough that we believe in the truth of Christianity, and that we may safely leave our faith to hold its own and win its way, without troubling ourselves much with the temporary opposition it excites. And we may grant at once that Christianity can no more be made false by being disbelieved, than, if false, it could be made true by being accepted. But that should not check our efforts at defence. For, however true, it may yet be widely disbelieved; and those who are most persuaded of the eternal truth of the great facts on which our faith depends, may nevertheless well shudder at the possibility of men coming generally to disbelieve those facts, and to lead the life which in the long run they are sure to lead, when they have turned their backs alike upon the hopes and the restraints of the Gospel. God forbid that such a fate should be in store for Christendom! Yet it makes one tremble to see how those who would go forth to meet the foe are often treated with a jealous suspicion or with a cold neglect, by those whose best interests they are serving. It makes one almost despair to see how much more devoted Christians are apt to be to the disputes by which they are divided than to the service of the one Lord by which they are, or ought to be, united.

So great a subject as "the Vitality of the Christian Faith" should demand prolonged time and pains for its adequate treatment. I can have no excuse for the poor and slight way in which it is dealt with here, save the unexpectedness of the call to lecture and the meagre time for preparation. But there can be no room to hesitate in recommending such a subject for reflection; and there may be some use in pointing out lines on which we may profitably work. *Grasp first the great central fact of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.* Everything depends on the reality of that. Establish that, and you can at once work back from it to the Incarnation, the Miracles and the Atonement, or forward to the Ascension, the mission of the Comforter, the present and future Reign over the peoples of the earth. See how with St. Paul the Resurrection is the starting point and ground of all Christian preaching. And see, too, how cogent a witness is St. Paul himself for the reality of the great fact to which he never tired of appealing. Remember that, amidst all attacks upon the New Testament, these four Epistles of St. Paul,—the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians and Corinthians,—stand unchallenged by the most destructive critics. Confine yourself, if you will, to these four Epistles, which are acknowledged as

being beyond all dispute the genuine productions of St. Paul. Look into them attentively, and see how solid a foundation they will yield for your belief in Jesus Christ. It is impossible here to go further into this important matter; but you will find the question forcibly and concisely treated in one of the lectures delivered for the Christian Evidence Society, entitled "The Evidential Value of St. Paul's Epistles." And on the general subject of our Lord's Resurrection from the dead, I know no better book than Canon Westcott's "Gospel of the Resurrection."

Again there is another line of thought of which it is impossible to over-estimate the value. *Look at the new type of character which dates from the coming of Jesus Christ. If Christ be not that which we believe Him to be; if He be not really risen from the dead; if His spirit be not really working among men; how then shall we account for that saintliness of life, which ever since His coming has been comparatively common, but which was alike unknown and unimagined by victorious Rome or polished Greece? Not a town—perhaps not a village or a street in Christendom—but can furnish its contingent of lives, such as might have been searched for in vain through the Roman Empire before the coming of Jesus Christ.* Grant the truth of the Gospel story, and this "new creation" is accounted for at once. Deny that Christ has risen, and his transfiguring His followers into His own Image, and you are left with an effect for which you can assign no reasonable cause.

The last line of thought and study which I will suggest grows naturally out of this. *Consider the history of the Church throughout these* 1800 *years. Dwell upon the wondrous story of its early triumph. Read of the deadly foes by which it was assailed, the series of victories by which it overcame. Remember its corruptions, and its reformations; its stains and its cleansing; the checquered yet glorious and progressive story of its growth. Ask yourself fairly how all this is to be accounted for, unless it be really founded on the rock of truth.* "One fact," says Canon Eaton, in the Preface to his Bampton Lectures on the Permanence of Christianity, "One fact, as it seems to me, must ever remain a stumbling-block in the path of infidel speculation. It is the existence, history, and standing of the Church of Christ. Active, influential, progressive; nurse of the brightest minds that shine in the galaxy of human story, of an Origen, an Augustine, a Dante, a Pascal, a Leibnitz, a Newton; handmaid to the spirit of man in his moments of loftiest devotion; mother of modern art; queen of the realm of benevolence and humanity; her doctrines can never be held akin to Pagan or Oriental superstitions, or be deemed unworthy of modern intelligence; neither can they be explained away as the unripe fruit of human evolution, or as the outcome of times of unreasoning ignorance. If only we apply to Christianity, as a phenomenon of man's history in the world, the same standard of estimation which we use in other things, and judge of its future by the past, there is small reason either to fear as to its perpetuity, or to predict its fall."

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 3, 1880.

"SOME THOUGHTS."

By M. A. M.

No. 5.—GOOD FOOLS.

WE all know that "folly is bound up in the heart of a child," yet it is equally true, though not so generally admitted, that it is apt to stick to us through life, but although there are endless varieties of fools in the world, they may all be classed under three heads. There is the thoughtless fool, the wicked fool, and the *good fool.* The most numerous, yet least influential, are the thoughtless fools; but although sometimes very mischievous, they are as a rule "a feeble folk," and often enemies to themselves rather than to others. The wicked fool is much less common, though far more hurtful; but the most dangerous, the most unmanageable of all, is the *good fool.*

The thoughtless fool may be stopt in his course by being convinced of his folly; the wicked fool is oftentimes held in check by the power of conscience, which is apt to assert itself at most inconvenient seasons, and say "thus far and no farther;" but when conscience and folly go hand in hand, the one not restrained, but urged on by the other, we have that, out of which may be made the most dangerous of men.

Erasmus tells us that the chief characteristic of folly is "self-satisfaction;" and this quality is found in the good fool to perfection. The thoughtless fool is often troubled with a lurking suspicion that he is a fool; the wicked fool knows not what self-satisfaction is; but the good fool has self-satisfaction written on his brow.

Tallien, a thoughtless fool of the worst type, was so restrained, and at length changed, by the influence of his gentle and beautiful wife, that he eventually became a humane and even useful citizen. Hébert was a wicked fool—one of the wickedest; Robespiere was a *good fool,* indeed, the prince of good fools, and although in Hébert the will was not wanting, for conscience in him seemed dead, the crimes committed by that abandoned wretch are not to be compared to the evil accomplished by the clean, precise, respectable, self-satisfied, and in a sense moral, Robespiere.

The inhuman cruelties of the Inquisition were perpetrated for the most part by *good fools;* many a wicked fool would stand aghast at crimes which those *good fools* committed without compunction.

But there are many kinds and degrees of *good fools,* from the good man, whose folly seldom shows itself, to the fool whose goodness it is difficult to discover. We need not, however, look back to a past age for all our examples, we see now, in one of our most eminent statesmen, a combination of goodness and folly so evenly balanced, that the *good fools* of our day are ready almost to worship him, indeed, it is difficult to say

which delights them most, his great goodness or his amazing folly, and so complete is his self-satisfaction, so impressed is he with his own goodness, that he seemed to believe not long since, that his political opponents were not only the most mistaken, but also the wickedest of men.

He might use the Royal prerogative to over-ride the decision of the Upper House, but he is such a "good man" that it must be right if he does it; yet, when his great opponent acts in opposition to his will, though with the full sanction of both Houses of Parliament, he calls it "Imperialism," and declares that the constitution is in danger. *He* may so offend a great and friendly power which has never been our enemy, though often our ally, that he had to write, and publish too, an apology, which even the cautious *Standard* characterised as "groveling," yet, neither he nor his faithful followers can see in the uncalled-for offence and the humiliating apology aught but the "noble impulses of a lofty soul."

The atrocity fever of 1876 was the triumphant work of *good fools*, aided, of course, by the great army of thoughtless fools; nothing but that combination of goodness and folly that *good fools* are made of, could have prompted an Englishman to utter those now too-famous words, "Perish India! perish British interests!"

Another thing that makes the *good fool* the most unmanageable of fools is, that whilst other fools are either ashamed of their folly, or are scarcely aware of it, to the good fool his folly is his chief delight We have lately seen a notable instance of this at Northampton. For once the *good fool* determined to surpass himself. To some it might seem a thing impossible that the super-orthodox dissenter should choose for his representative in Parliament an avowed *atheist*, but to the real *good fool* there was a delicious excess of folly in the idea that was quite irresistible. True, some weak brethren sought the advice of a stronger brother, whose wealth has made him famous, but a "hasty telegram" at once satisfied their easy consciences, and it is pleasant and instructive to note how a *certain kind* of wisdom may sometimes be found linked with the most egregious folly. The wealthy brother showed the folly of the *good fool* in the advice which he gave, the goodness of the *good fool* in "deeply regretting it the next morning," and "the wisdom of the serpent" in taking care that no one should know of his "deep regret" until his godless protégé was safely elected.

Somewhat akin to the triumph of folly at Northampton is the Ripon folly It is not long since that the eminent statesman, to whom we have already referred, lashed himself into a fury in his attack on the Papacy, and declared that *henceforth no consistent Roman Catholic could safely be intrusted with a high office in the State* It was, therefore, only consistent with the strange inconsistency of that eminent statesman, that his very first act, when restored to power by those dissenters whose charge against the Church is that it "savours of Popery," should be to raise to the highest and most responsible office in the Empire a *Romish pervert*, and that, not because of his unequalled abilities or his pre-eminent fitness for the office, but because he is a Romish pervert! Here too was an excess of folly, which our erratic statesman could no more help indulging in than could the *good fools* of Northampton resist the rare opportunity offered to them. And I cannot but feel indignant when I remember that, had Lord Ripon not forsaken those principles of religious freedom which have made England what she is, he would have remained in the quiet obscurity for which nature evidently intended him: but because he has embraced that strange yet fascinating mixture of Christianity and Heathenism called Popery, I say *because* he has done this, and *only because* he has done this, therefore all the talent and wisdom and experience which was ready to hand is set aside for *him*, therefore he is made the representative of our Empress Queen and the ruler of two hundred millions of her subjects. We spend hundreds of thousands every year in endeavouring to turn men from idols to serve the living God, and yet we send to rule over them one who is taught by his priests to "make unto himself a graven image and bow down to it," * and the *good fools* try to persuade themselves that to object to this folly shows a narrow mind.

If a peculiarly atrocious murder is committed, the *good fools* of a certain type at once manifest themselves. Others feel for the innocent victim, not so the good fools, all their sympathy is with the murderer, if they can but convert him, and save him from the gallows, or, failing that, if they can only comfort him, they feel much refreshed; thousands of innocent sorrowing beings are around them, but ten thousand virtuous souls fail to awaken in the breasts of those good fools so much sympathy as one cowardly asassin.

Surely we want a second Erasmus to write a new "Praise of Folly;" he would find an *embarras de richesses*, such as his learned forerunner never conceived of.

It is related of a certain quack doctor, that a physician once said to him, "How is it that you, with your little knowledge of medicine, have made a great fortune, whilst I can barely make a living?" "See those ten men," he replied; "how many wise men, think you. are there amongst them?" "Probably not more than one," answered the physician, "Then," said the quack, "you take the one wise man, I take the fools." The quack doctor is not the only man who has found it to his interest to cater for the fools.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE LAITY AND THE BURIALS BILL.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—"An attached Lay member of the Church" in the person of Mr. Low has been kind enough to answer my letters on the above subject. I thank him for giving us the Layman's view, always desirable and worthy of consideration. His letter demands some comment. First of all I fail to *see* how the verse he quotes has anything whatever to do with the subject before us. If he can, as I suppose he wishes to do, take that verse and make it a suitable Biblical authority for the toleration which he so much misses in our Church, it seems to me that he is making a great deal out of a very little. But let that pass; Mr. Low goes on to tell us that "hitherto the Church has had a strong hold upon the thinking Laity. . . . from the fact that . . . she alone was tolerant." This is news to me. I should have said that the Church of the present was more tolerant than the Church of the past. But what does Mr. Low means by "toleration?" Does he think that toleration includes a strictly literal interpretation of

* The writer has in his possession the photograph of a car made by the Roman Catholic missionaries of India in exact imitation of the Juggernaut Car, but to contain an image of the Virgin Mary instead of Juggernaut, long ropes are attached to it the same as to the Juggernaut Car.

those words of our Lord about giving up coat and cloak to those who would take one of the two? If this is toleration, we have been going in rather lavishly for this sort of donative during the past few years. We have surrendered so much of our clothing that very soon we shall be quite naked! I suppose Mr. Low, in speaking about "toleration" is really hinting about the charitable act of surrendering our churchyards to Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Hereticks! Mr. Low thinks this characteristic of toleration "is fast disappearing, and because it is vanishing away, therefore the Laity have kept aloof of late in Church legislation." Well, toleration is a great and a good thing, it is not everything nor is it always demanded. He who told us to give the other cheek if smitten on the one, rather sternly rebuked the impudent fellow who insulted Him in the Judgment Hall! Toleration has its limits. We have our rights to think of. There is such a quality as justice. We have given up a great deal, so much that if our worthy ancestors were to come amongst us again they would be greatly shocked, I fear, at our "Broad" views on religion, and at our parting with this and that prerogative which was once our boast.

But Mr. Low has another reason to give for this "apathy" on the part of the Laity. He told us "there are towns in England where churches are to be found, where the clergy hold such extraordinary views or points of doctrine, and practice, that it is hard for men of average intellect to know wherein they agree." But in this difference of opinion he detects two points of similarity—impatience of the Church system, and intolerance towards those who presume to take broader views of God's Commandments. And these two features of the Church of the present day explain the acknowledged apathy of our Laymen. Surely Mr. Low is making a mountain out of a molehill! He himself hopes that the towns where these unfortunate churches exist are few in number. So they are—few. I have not been to any of these "towns" and heard "views diametrically opposite." After all, if we come to think of it, High, Low, and Broad Churchmen do *not* disagree to the extent some timid ones give them credit for. Do not our Church Congresses, do not our Societies' Meetings tell us that there is really *more* toleration now than there was? And even if what Mr. Low says be not exaggerated, does he think that things will be improved by the apathy of the Laity? When this road on which you are travelling breaks off into two ways, at first the divergence is hardly perceptible; it soon, however, becomes so, and after a time the roads may be miles apart! And so if Clergy and Laity separate—if the one be afraid of and keep aloof from the other—the mischief will but be increased. Does Mr. Low ever ask himself the question—May not this very apathy of the Laity be the very means of causing all this confessedly dangerous leaning towards Romanism? If our Laymen suspect us, and if they avoid us as suspected, it makes us inclined to disregard their wishes and treat them with a contempt which would be far from our thoughts if they worked more heartily with us? Let them stand our friends and trust us more, not flying into a passion because this or that is introduced into the services which was not there when their great-grandmother sat in the old square pew in the chancel of their old whitewashed church: they would then find that the Clergy would be careful to please those who meant kindly towards them. Mr. Low refers to "Burial Scandals." He ought in fairness to have called them "Newspaper Scandals." A Clergyman is asked to bury an unbaptized child. The Prayer-Book, which he is bound to obey, tells him plainly not to do so. He refuses, and the next issue of the "Daily Run-Down-the-Church" puts in large type, "Another Burial Scandal," and the readers of the paper heave a sigh, and perhaps follow Mr. Low's example, and determine to hold aloof from the Church which is anxious to maintain her rights!

ARTHUR R. BARTLETT.

The Chantry, Berkeley.

—:o:—

THE BURIALS BILL.

SIR,—I am old enough to remember the struggle which ended in the abolition of compulsory Church Rates, and the arguments which were then urged on both sides. The plea put forward by the Nonconformists was, that it was grossly unjust to compel them to pay a rate towards the maintenance of Churches and Churchyards which belong exclusively to Church-people. Of course, in view of the present agitation for an equal *right* with Church-people to use their own Burial Services in our Churchyards, all that fight against Church Rates was a false move. By that fight and by accepting the abolition of the compulsory rate, they "contracted themselves out of," even, the shadow of a right to put forward their present claim. Their present attitude is, simply, one of renewed attack upon the Church. With regard to Church-people, and their attitude in this question, I would ask those who are willing to concede the present claim of Nonconformists, whence they derive their moral right to do so? The Churches and Churchyards are not ours, to be dealt with at our pleasure; we are only trustees for life, bound to hand them down to our children as free as we have received them. From whom, and since when, have we, Bishops, clergy, or laity, received a dispensation to compromise away that of which we are no more than trustees? No doubt, Parliament has the *power* to carry this measure and to visit disobedience to its provisions with pains and penalties; but that is a separate question, and "Might" does not "make Right." The present measure is an unconstitutional invasion of the liberties of the Church of England. Assuming our present constitution in Church and State to be, still, a reality, no alteration in *discipline* or doctrine can be made "without the consent of the Church in Convocation." . . . . "The State has a veto on all changes, but cannot originate any." . . . . "Both Parliament and Convocation must unite, as they did when the Act of Uniformity was passed, to make, according to our constitution in Church and State, such a law." I may be told, perhaps, that the two Primates and half the Bishops have supported this measure; that may be a forcible argument for seeking the withdrawl of their Lordships from the House of Lords, but it does not prove that the Church has accepted Lord Selborne's Bill. Even had the Bishops been unanimous in voting for the Bill, it is clear that their Lordships no more constituted the Church, than the House of Lords constituted the Realm.

Let me add one word about Mr. Lowe's difficulty. The question, I would respectfully suggest, which he, as a layman, should consider, is not whether certain of the clergy agree with each other, but whether their teaching agrees with the Prayer Book. The laity of the Church are not left at the mercy of individual teachers. I am well aware that hero-worship is too much the fashion in this matter; but if it leads to confusion of thought, it seems to me that the worshippers have only themselves

to blame. As regards your own plea that "unrestrained participation in the Churchyards will induce Dissenters to regard the Church with less aversion, &c.," I venture to think that the logical inference from such a plea is that we should also concede to them the "unrestrained participation" in the Churches. In fact, those who support Lord Selborne's Bill will find themselves, hereafter, precluded from offering any logical opposition to the concession of our Churches, and the Nonconformists tell us so with very straightforward candour.

A COUNTRY VICAR.

———:o:———

SAINT MICHAEL AND SAINT GEORGE.

SIR,—Would any one kindly inform me what books are necessary for reading and reference to obtain information as to the Early Church History and Bible Authority for the most distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George?

EASTBOURNE.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE CHRISTIAN IN HIS RELATIONS TO THE CHURCH, THE WORLD, AND THE FAMILY." By Rev. Daniel Moore, M.A. Cassell, Petter, Galpin, and Co. Pp. 115.

"Particular rules and directions," observes Bishop Butler in his Charge to the clergy of the Diocese of Durham, in 1751, "concerning the times and circumstance for performing acknowledged duties, bring religion nearer to practice, and prudently recommended would have an influence upon the people." "Prudently," indeed, has Mr. Moore "recommended" the "rules and directions" contained in this volume, to the people to whom he ministers in his well-attended Church, Holy Trinity, Paddington. From its pulpit he delivered the seven lectures—recently sent for review. The Christian is considered in his relation to the Church, to the social system, and to business. Then follow two lectures upon "Married Life;" the last two of the series being entitled respectively "The Christian as a Parent," and "The Christian as a Master." The most forcible part of the introductory lecture (in which the author, having remarked upon the origin of the name *Christian*, used, at first, as a term of reproach by the adversaries of the Gospel, but in fact one of the most honorable titles to which man could lay claim, proceeds to deal successively with the relation of Christ's followers, towards the enemies of the Church; to strifes and divisions within her, to her agencies and organisations, worship, and ordinances), is that in which the Christian's relation to the Eurcharist is treated of. "With regard," observes Mr. Moore, "to the number of professing Christians who *do* partake of of that holy ordinance, compared with those who do *not*, we are brought face to face with one of the strangest anomalies of our practical Christianity. Viewed in the light of religious consistency, the fewness of the number of communicants when taken in the aggregate must be marvel "to the world, to angels, and to men." Is it possible that man can have realized the awful dignity of this Sacrament, the solemn circumstances of its institution, the avowed design of its appointment, and above all, the emphatic declaration of the Master, that in a faithful and continuous observance of this holy mystery, depends the life of the soul; and yet that so many live in neglect of it all their life long; or if they do not neglect it altogether, receive it only at the most widely separated intervals,—after the fashion of some quarterly roll-call—or, perhaps, as an annual tribute of respect to the Church which first gave them their Christian name." The number of *female* is largely, the author observes, in excess of that of *male* communicants. "Why," he asks, "is this? Whence have people derived the motion of this two-faced Christianity? of a Gospel for *woman*, not being a Gospel for *man*, of a Sacrament needful for the saving of a *woman's* soul, but not needful for the saving of the *man's*." There are some lessons of Christian wisdom in the second lecture, "the Christian in society," which those whose "zeal towards God" is not "according to knowledge," who rashly and inconsiderately and at inopportune seasons introduce the mention of religious topics, would do well to study, and to follow. Founding his observations in this lecture, upon the Pauline exhortation, "Let everyone of us please his neighbour for his good to edification," he gives some excellent advice with reference to the discharge of that very difficult and delicate social duty—the administrations of Christian rebuke—and shews the necessity for a careful discrimination between the persons to whom observations upon spiritual subjects are to be made, and a judicious observance of the times and opportunities for making them. "To begin by using the hackneyed phrases of a religious school with men of high culture and intelligence, to press the obligations of a refined and mature Christianity, upon one who is only just setting out towards Zion, "with his face thitherwards," to begin with a strictly moral and upright man, by setting forth the terrors of eternal judgment, or to enlarge in speaking to the vicious man, upon the Christian's joy, and hope, and peace in believing; to try to get a hearing for serious subjects, while men are listening to the sounds of mirth and revelry; or, in the presence of his ungodly associates, to try to convince a man of his folly and his sin—all these are great mistakes, not only useless, but likely to be hurtful to the cause that we desire to serve." The two lectures on "The Christian in Married Life" are full of instruction, the first addressed to husbands, the second to wives, from the text "Heirs together of the grace of life." He concludes with two counsels, bearing upon the high calling, to which St. Peter refers in that passage; the first having reference to the duty of mutual forbearance, the second to that of cherishing a mutual solicitude for each other's salvation. In urging the necessity for the performance of the latter duty, he quotes the serious dying admonition of an aged Christian, who assembling his married children, before his departure in peace, like Simeon of old, thus addressed them: "Be often in conversation with your partners upon the state of each other's soul."

The parental obligations of Christians, and those devolving upon them as heads of households, occupying a position of great responsibility as having servants of whom to take oversight and whom to train for the service of Christ by precept and example, form the subject of the concluding Lecture. One passage in this practical discourse (page 110) may be quoted as a specimen of the Scriptural tone which pervades it. "The relations subsisting between Abraham and Eliezer, or between Barzillai and Chimham, or between St. Paul and the runaway slave, are very noteworthy in this respect. There is nothing in such examples to countenance that easy, levelling, transatlantic familiarity which some persons think it necessary to maintain with their domestics—a familiarity which good servants neither

expect nor desire; but only that kind and friendly manner of speaking and dealing with them everywhere commended to us in Scripture. Take as an example that refined and graceful picture contained in the Book of Ruth. There a master going into his field at harvest-time exclaims, as he draws near to his reapers, 'The Lord be with you;' whereupon the servants, taking up the language of reciprocated but respectful courtesy, reply to their master in the words, 'The Lord bless thee.'" The conscientious discharge of Christian duty in this important but too-much-forgotten relation—that of masters to their domestics, is finally shewn to have a beneficial influence in cementing the hallowed bond of Church union; all the members of the household encouraging one another as members of God's vast "household, the Church;" by the example of a righteous life, and by remembering one another in their intercession before "the Throne of the Heavenly Grace." Eminently useful are such lectures, and well calculated to be edifying to parochial congregations. The writer has, from time to time, evidenced the possession of literary qualifications which enable him to deal efficiently with abstruse subjects, and, in his capacity as Hulsean Lecturer, has preached with ability before the University of Cambridge. In the series now reviewed he has wisely adopted the simple, and, at the same time, forcible mode of giving expression to his thoughts which renders what he says intelligible to the masses, thus proving that he can be a practical as well as an erudite preacher. A careful perusal of this volume is earnestly recommended. Replete with useful hints upon the subject of circumspect and exemplary living, it merits an extended circulation. As regards it, as well as several other practical works which Mr. Moore has written, the press comes in as a powerful auxiliary to the pulpit, giving his utterances of affectionate Christian counsel and admonition that permanence which for the edifying of the Church it is most desirable they should have. The eminent firm whose names appear in the title-page have published the work in a manner highly commendable, the typography and binding being all that could be desired.

———:o:———

We have received from Messrs. "W. and A. K. Johnston," of Edinburgh and London, "Johnston's Bible Atlas," a small book of twelve maps, in a paper cover, strongly fastened together, showing the Gentile Nations and Countries of the Old Testament, Ancient and Modern Palestine, etc.—and the prevailing religions of the World.

The plates are executed and colored with care and with a considerable amount of accuracy. For instance, the Southern boundary of the tribe of Asher on map three is carried down to Lihor Libnath (Joshua xix. v. 26) instead of only to Mount Carmel, as shown in the Map of Bagster's well-known Bible.

We, however, differ as to the position of Ramoth Gilead, the city of Refuge for the tribe of Gad, which should in our opinion have been near the site of the modern town Es-salt, and not far from Mount Gilead, from which it took its name, Ramoth Gilead (in the heights of Gilead). Its position in the "Bible Atlas" is given about fifteen miles south-east the sea of Cinneroth. But this is a point on which no one would care to speak with any great certainty. Altogether we must congratulate Messrs. Johnston on producing so useful a book at so moderate a price. It will, we doubt not, be highly appreciated by Teachers at Sunday Schools and families in their own homes for instruction in Biblical Geography.

Canon Cook, of Exeter, the editor of the *Speaker's Commentary*, has resigned the preachership of Lincoln's-Inn, which he had held since the Archbishop of York's resignation in 1869, and the Rev. Henry Wace, the present chaplain, late Bampton Lecturer at Oxford, has been elected to succeed him. The office of Chaplain to the Inn thereby becomes vacant, and we are informed that the Bench will elect a Chaplain on Tuesday, the 20th of July, from such candidates as may offer themselves on or before the 16th of July.

Mr. Spurgeon on the Appointment of the New Indian Viceroy.—Mr. Spurgeon writes to say:—"My hands are more than full, or I would attend the meeting. I think Mr. Gladstone has made a great mistake in appointing a Roman Catholic Viceroy in India. So long as the Law of Settlement is in force, it seems to be involved in the Protestant succession to the Throne that all Viceroys should be Protestants also. Our predecessors judged from painful experience that Papists would not allow them their liberties if they mounted the Throne, and therefore they excluded them. I do not think that the English people are prepared to remove this safeguard, and, while it remains, it seems clear to me that her Majesty's Viceroys must not be Catholics. On this and other grounds I am extremely sorry that the present Government should thus expose itself to just criticism, and grieve its own supporters."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barber, Rev. H. W., Oxon, senior curate of Houghton-le-Spring; vicar of Ryhope.
Barrow, Rev. Alfred H., curate of Acton; chaplain, Madras Establishment.
Blackett, Rev. H. R., vicar of St. Andrew's, Croydon.
Fitch, Rev. T. W., curate of Tilmanstone, Kent.
Graham, Rev. Thomas, vicar of St. James's, Bristol; vicar of St. Paul's, Islington.
Harton, Rev. J. W., curate-in-charge of Westbury-on-Trym.
Langshaw, Rev. H., curate of Heckfield; rector of Silchester.
Lane, Rev. H. T., curate of Christ Church, Albany-street; diocesan inspector of schools for Archdeaconry of St. Alban's and rural dean of Barking, Diocese of St. Alban's.
Lefevre, Rev. P. A., curate of St. Heliers and vice-dean of Jersey.
Oldfield, Rev. G. Biscoe, rector of Berwick St. Leonard-cum-Sedgehill; organising secretary of S.P.G. for the Archdeaconry of Sarum.
Redpath, Rev. Henry Adeney, vicar of Wolvercot.
Tapper, Rev. J. W., incumbent of St. James's, St. Heliers, Jersey.
Thomas, Rev. Thomas Kearsey, rector of Winforton, Hereford; domestic chaplain to the Earl of Roden.
Wyat, Rev. G. D., curate of Greyfriars, Reading; vicar of Highbury, Berks.

———:o:———

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Birkett, Rev. J. B., M.A., at Gravely Rectory, Cambridgeshire, canon of Ely and rural dean, on the 15th inst., aged 64.
Everard, Rev. E. J., at Tormarton Rectory, Gloucestershire, rector of Tormarton, formerly rector of Didmarton, on the 13th inst., aged 66.
Innes, the Ven. Gustavus Archibald Clunes, at Hamilton, Victoria, Archdeacon of Hamilton, on April the 9th, aged 41.
Newman, Rev. Edward, at Ecclesall Vicarage, Sheffield, twenty-four years vicar of the above parish, and formerly Missionary of the C.M.S., on the 13th inst., aged 67.
Nimmo, Rev. Robert, M.A., R.N., F.R.G.S., chaplain, on board H.M.S. *Atalanta*, only son of the late G. Nimmo, Esq., of Grantchester, Cambridge, in February, aged 40.
Robertson, Rev. Ernest Gillett, A.K.C., at 123, Adelaide-road, N.W., late curate of Rottiford, Oxon, second and dearly loved son of the Rev. Dr. Robertson, chaplain of St. John the Evangelist, Haverstock-hill, on the 27th ult., aged 24.

The Church of England Pulpit.

"DAILY BREAD."

By the Rev. EDWARD THRING, M.A.,
Head Master of Uppingham School.

Sermon Preached in the School Chapel.

"Give us this day our daily bread."—St. Matt. vi. 11.

AT first sight nothing can seem to touch the young less than this prayer. Your daily bread appears to come to you as a matter of course, and many thousands never know what it is to be in danger of absolute want all their lives. What have you and they to do with a prayer for daily bread, when there is so little chance of your ever wanting it; when, at all events, at the present moment your daily bread is sure? Many look on the prayer as nothing more than an acknowledgment that the food comes from God; many again, who have the daily bread, look on the prayer as a prayer for the bread of life, as indeed it is; but whilst it is a prayer for the bread of life, it is in the first instance a prayer for the daily bread by which the body lives, and a very touching prayer too on the lips of the poor and the desolate; prayed with many a tear and trembling fervour daily in hunger-pinched homes. Are the rich, then, shut out? Because land brings forth plentifully, and barns are full, and much food laid up for many years, is the prayer for daily bread needless? or you, because you are here cared for, and shielded from all want, and fed from ready tables, is the prayer for daily bread needless? I mean for the actual food you eat. This very day, for instance, you have had the prayer on your lips often, and you knew all the time the daily bread was ready, what have you prayed for? Daily bread, remember, prayed for daily, not a far-off future supply; prayed for every day, though the bread is there, what does it mean? The bread is indeed there, but that has little to do with the prayer. It is not a matter of food only, it is also a prayer, it is also an asking on your part, it is also an asking of God. Whether you get your daily bread from God depends on you and your heart. Whether you get your daily bread from God, or are listening to the Tempter's voice, saying as of old, "Command that these stones be made bread;" whether it is God's bread or Devil's bread, the fruit of prayer, or the fruit of selfish and evil-hearted thoughts and work, does matter. It is the whole matter. The bread may be here indeed in plenty, and at the same table may sit those to whom it is bread given by God: God's bread, as you have prayed it shall be, and those to whom it is bread got at the Devil's bidding; Devil's bread, taken and used as such. The question is not whether you get bread, but whether you get bread from God, and use it as God's bread. And there is no more searching question in the world than this. It concerns the young most of all, for they are beginning.

Is the bread you eat given by God at your prayer? or, in other words, is your common life such a life as can ask God honestly for food to keep it on; such a life as takes God's bread knowing it to be from his hand, and uses the life nourished by it in a manner worthy of God's bread. Is it an honest life, true and hearty, always trying to do the best? If so, your bread is from God, and your prayer is a true one. But that is the question, not food only, but whom you ask for it, and where it comes from. You ask it of God. It is God's bread you have to do with. And it enters into you, and supports your life, and runs through all your veins in health and strength. How have you earned it? every drop of blood in your body cries out as a witness if your life is untrue. The very crumbs from off your table shall curse you, if you have not dealt with them honestly; yea, like the manna, it shall stink and be corrupt, an abomination and a loathing, if coming from heaven it be turned into base uses on earth. How have you earned the bread of God you pray for? The bread is here for the evil and the good alike: and earning it equally means work done to get it, and work done because of having it.

If a rich man pays his labourers for work they earn it; but also if a rich man gives alms to his pensioners, and they give him heart-service and love; or presents to his friends, and they rally round him always, they too earn it; they are traitors if they take, and turn against the giver. The labourer who does bad work for his wages is so far a cheat, but the pensioner who lives by his lord's liberality and then injures his lord is a traitor, a mean ungrateful traitor. So in this matter of daily bread, the man who earns his bread dishonestly is a dishonest labourer, but all who sit at ready tables, and live on what they have not toiled for, and dwell in houses that they builded not, all these, far more than the labourer, owe their hearts to the Father in Heaven who has made all these blessings wait on them. It *is* the part of the Heavenly Father to give His children the unbought portions of sons, but it is their part to be sons indeed, and to give the love and gratitude of sons. So let us put out of sight at present all thought of having laboured, and won the daily bread, as far as work done goes, by labour; and take only the case of those, who like you, have everything made ready for them; those, who like you, pray God for daily bread, whilst the daily bread is prepared and safe for you without anything done by you to get it.

You sit as it were with Christ on the hill side, and the bread is passed to you by the disciples, straight from Him, and you take, and eat it, simply because you are in His Company, and then you rise and go your way to your own homes, that is to your own heart pursuits, strengthened by the gift of divine hands. You ask to have bread from God, and you have it. What does this mean? It means that your whole life is by you own lips dedicated to God, by your own prayer for daily bread taken from His Hand. It means that the prayer concerns you, in a far higher way that it concerns the man who in a sense wins his bread by labour. To you it is a free gift, before you have done anything, and from you is required the love and gratitude of one who receives a present.

You pray God to give you His bread. Now after such a prayer what do you do with it? The bread passes into your body, turns into your blood, runs through every vein, becomes your life. Then, I presume, your life is full of love for your Father, and that in every possible way you show by doing His will that you know, and feel that you have prayed this prayer, have asked from God, have got what you asked, and earnestly desire to be grateful. Every drop of blood in your veins shall cry out against you if you waste or pollute God's gift. Even as the first murderer heard "the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground" because the lost life was so precious in God's sight, so also shall their own blood cry out against those who pray for daily bread and corrupt the life it gives, and let their blood be spent in evil; so also shall the lost life, the life lost in ungrateful contempt for the giver, cry for vengeance against him who loses it. For the prayer to God for daily bread demands that the daily bread be taken as a holy gift for God's service.

Brethren, you are making a new beginning to-day, one of those many, which the wise Ordainer of man's life has provided to make man's life have many opportunities for better things. To-day remember your prayer; remember how, day by day, morning and evening, you kneel before God to ask for bread, to ask Him to be with you in His gift. It is God's bread, and you take it as such; O never take a mouthful with which His life does not go; let His life go with it, and, as you feel the blood in your veins flush with life and strength, remember what the life is, and match it, boldly match it, honestly match it against every task, and make each task a thanksgiving to God of work done and idleness conquered; set the life that day by day is given you to pure high thoughts, and manly actions. And as you pray the daily prayer for God's bread, keep close the daily hope of doing truth for God; always giving of your best, for that is truth. Every drop of blood in your veins is an answer to the prayer for daily bread; you take it from God, and every action all through the day done by that life-blood should be a current of life work running freshly with your blood, the life shown by true works of life. God gives the life, you ask it of Him, you get it, are you then fit to live? a question for the young most of all. You daily take your life, in prayer for daily bread, from God. Are you fit to live? Let this Term answer "yes."

NATIONAL IMPROVIDENCE.

By the Rev. W. L. BLACKLEY, M.A., Rector of North Waltham, Hants.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, September 28th, 1879.

"Now, therefore, thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Consider your ways. Ye have sown much and bring in little: ye eat, but ye have not enough; ye drink, but ye are not filled with drink; ye clothe you, but there is none warm; and he that earneth wages earneth wages to put it into a bag with holes. Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Consider your ways."—Haggai i. 5, 6, 7.

THERE are always people to be found ready to limit the liberty of the pulpit; and in some directions their purpose may be right. The preacher who takes advantage of an audience assembled to gain some guidance on the way to heaven, in order to distract their attention and excite their feelings on merely party politics, is a man false to his function and wasteful of his opportunity; his discourse is a mistake as a sermon, or he himself is a mistake as a preacher. And this truth is so generally accepted that we find all party politics, as a rule, excluded from the pulpits of the Church of England.

Much the same thing may be urged with regard to social politics, so far, at least, as their discussion tends to cause disunion and debate, and the points discussed have no immediate necessary connection with the religious business of all Christian people, with the leading of a holy life, the dying in a hopeful death, the entrance into endless glory through the merits of our Lord. Thus, however good in their own way such topics as secular education, improved sanitation, purity of election, and so forth, may be, we have no revelation making any one of them a Christian duty, and, as a rule, their advocacy or rejection is felt unsuited to the pulpit.

This objection, however, cannot be fairly made against the pulpit treatment of that branch of social politics, National Improvidence, the sin, the prevalence, and the moral hurt of which I wish to bring before your minds to-day, while trying to direct you to a possible remedy for much of the harm it causes to our moral nature, and of the hindrance which it really opposes to our national progress in religious life.

And surely the text I have chosen may be held to justify my handling of the subject. The Jews referred to in it had apparently all things they needed, and yet they were discontented and unprosperous. These words were not merely spoken by Haggai the prophet to Zerubbabel, the governor, as

a matter of private individual counsel as a bishop might speak to a prime minister; it was the Lord of Hosts Himself who spoke to His own people, and imposed upon them as an universal duty to look keenly into their social politics in order to learn why they were unhappy, dissatisfied, and anxious. It was God Himself who began and ended this special exhortation with the solemn words, "Consider your ways."

You will see the whole subject treated is National Improvidence. The means of life were abundant, and yet men were dissatisfied. And so it is with us in England, with this one difference, that the National Improvidence of the Jews here spoken of was a punishment of their neglect of God, while our National Improvidence is a hindrance to our true approach to Him as a nation. The busiest, most energetic, most eager race of toilers in the universe, we send our ventures far over all the globe, and sow our means to multiply a thousand-fold. The richest nation in the universe, we yet show within a stone's throw of our greatest hoards a ghastly and shameful contrast of the most appalling poverty and destitution conceivable by mortal man. Whilst this exists, do not the words of our text apply to us—"Ye have sown much, and bring in little."

Again, when we look, as thoughtful men must do, on the enormous waste of means and comfort caused by our national self-indulgence, and the absolute want and almost starvation resulting thence to millions of our fellow-men; when we think of the growing and appalling passion for destructive drink, which, while it wastes each year forty million bushels of grain,* which might feed the people, in making the useless liquor which poisons them instead, and leaves them each year with a rage of thirst not only unslaked but growing,† must we not see a wonderful description of our present state in this other thing which God tells us to consider—"Ye eat, but ye have not enough; ye drink, but are not satisfied with drink."

And when we look a little further into our national condition, noting that though in England, in almost every branch of industry, the day's work is shorter and the day's wage greater, than in any other country in Europe, yet a huge proportion of our fellow-countrymen who look forward at all, are looking forward to living on forced public taxation (not on alms), and dying poor and dependent, scantily fed, meanly clad, and lonely, in a workhouse, the words come home to us with shocking bluntness, but with incontrovertible truth—"He that earneth wages, earneth wages to put in a bag with holes."

I have said I would consider first the sin of National Improvidence; and to do this I must refute a very common but mistaken notion, that Bible teaching generally is opposed to worldly notions of prudence. Men quote our Saviour's words, "Take, therefore, no thought for the morrow," without our Saviour's context. His object was to prevent their letting care for providing earthly things cause them to neglect providing heavenly things. He never said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and become materially destitute," but "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things, which the Gentiles also seek, shall be added to you." The same voice which sent forth the disciples without money in their purse at one time (not to teach them that the having of money was a sin, but to show them that God would provide his labourers' hire), was the same voice which gave to the same men a different instruction in different circumstances, and said, "*Now*, he that hath a purse let him take it, and likewise his scrip." It was not because Dives possessed, but because he misused, wealth that he was tormented; nor are we taught that had he chosen to squander it all away and live in beggary he would have gone to heaven for so doing. Part of the blessing of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, actually consisted of worldly goods and comforts; and we are told expressly that Job's possessions after his suffering were double of what they were before as proof that the Lord "blessed the latter end of Job more than the beginning."

So much from the New Testament and from the Old to show that the possession of competence is not a crime. Our Saviour's blessed words to which I have referred, teach us, indeed, to depend upon God for health and strength and means of support, but nowhere teach us to regard a life of beggary as an exercise of religion, or the cultivation of destitution as a moral duty of man.

No, but far more than this, our blessed Saviour shows us waste to be wicked, and wilful destitution a sin, not merely as being an offence and trouble to social politics, but as an iniquity against the honour of God, who, in ordaining that man should eat bread in the sweat of his brow, has laid on every man the duty of self-provision. How plainly the Lord teaches this in the parable of the Prodigal, whom he puts before us as a sinner repentant for an unquestionable sin, not as a saint successful in a confident presumption. For he makes the prodigal confess, first the moral, and then the social wickedness of his waste in the words: "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son."

The religion of Christ, as set forth by His inspired apostles, carries on this teaching, and points to the sin of improvidence in no measured terms. They never contemplate a state of things in which men shall expect fellow-men in every case of need to supply all their necessities. They teach, as our Saviour did, dependence on God, but not on man; and, indeed, if this last were Christian duty, and all

* In delivering my sermon I gave seventy-five million bushels, the actual amount *used*. That it was all *wasted* was, of course, my individual opinion then and is now. But I readily, in concession to an indignant critic, modify the statement; even he will not say that there is *no* waste, nor that *half* the liquor made is really needed; and the amount now given suffices for my argument.

† The amount of spirits consumed per head of population is about forty per cent. higher now than fifteen years ago.

the world fulfilled it, the human race would die of hunger in a year. The apostle who could, and did, give up all things for Christ's sake, worked with his hands that he might be chargeable to none, and boldly denied the very name of Christians to improvident men. "If a man will not work," he says, "neither let him eat." And again: "If a man provide not for his own, and specially for them that are of his own house (and how could a man do this without providing for himself?) he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

So much for the *sin* of Improvidence and wilful dependence. I come next to examine its prevalence.

And let me note that here I am speaking, not of individual improvidence,* of which examples may be found everywhere throughout the universe, but of National Improvidence as it exists in England, without a parallel in all creation.

It may be said, of course, that this statement is an assumption; that to predicate of this man or that man whom we pass in the street that he is improvident or unprovided, is to dogmatise on a matter of which we know nothing, since a man of mean appearance may be the owner of thousands of pounds. This is true; but there are safer places than the streets from which to draw my proof. We have here in England a ghastly list which no other nation in the world can equal, in proportion to population, of more than seven hundred thousand persons depending for their daily bread not on their own exertions, past or present, not on the Christian charity of the rich, by any means, but on the forced taxation of the provident of all classes, high and low alike.

And this compulsory levy reaches year by year from seven to eight million pounds of money, the paying and the spending of which alike are barren of blessing or of good. The pauperism of England is at once the plain measure, and the deplorable illustration, of the improvidence of England, and testifies both to a national neglect of Christian duty and its inevitable Nemesis of misery and wrong.

For our Poor-rate is no Charity; it blesses neither him that gives nor him that receives. The payer loathes the burden, not from a sense of covetousness, but from a hatred of injustice; and the pauper claims as a right the insufficient dole which only prolongs his life by prolonging his misery, and which keeps him still the very poorest of the very poor, joyless, friendless, hopeless till the end.

It does not require much examination to see how deeply this inoculation of pauperism has infected the whole spirit of our nation. Our plan of compelling the provident to add to their own burden the support of the improvident has taught multitudes to regard all providence as a folly, and to waste every shilling they receive.

You will find this illustrated by our very language. We speak now of "savings," "savings' bank," "saving habits," where other nations speak of "sparings," "sparings banks," "sparing habits;" but we find no such use as our present one of the word "saving" in our Early English, or in our Bible translation. It was only after our English law had committed the great error of establishing our pauper system that all "gains" came to be instinctively regarded as only earned to be wasted and lost, and, in proportion as they escaped that destiny, were fitly spoken of as being "saved!"

Is this enough to say, in illustration of the prevalence of improvidence at the present day? Is it sufficient to point, as I do, in no spirit of taunt or unkindness, but of heartfelt pity, to hundreds of thousands of hopeless poor who are paupers now, to the millions who, as a matter of mere arithmetic, in ten years' time will have joined their ranks, as proof of the prevalent disease of improvidence among us? No, my brethren, I must say something more. In this very house of God, this very day, there must be a percentage of men who, though they be well clad, well-fed, well sheltered now, know in their very hearts, that by some want of Christian self-denial, some yielding to un-Christian self-indulgence, some conscious neglect of the Christian duty of providing for themselves and those depending on them, they will remember my words when one day they may have to pass the workhouse door themselves, claiming their woeful privilege of pauper life and pauper death, and pauper burial, from the hard earnings of many an honest, toiling, independent man, on whose position as compared to theirs they may be looking down to-day. So great, so widespread, and so sad, is the national sin among us of Improvidence.

But, it may be said, if men choose it so, if they set present pleasure which they can enjoy against future want which they may not live to suffer, who has a right to complain? My answer is, that every just man in the nation has a right to complain, not indeed, of present paupers, for they are too distant to hear and too miserable to resent our murmurings. And, besides, they are not to blame, they only follow the natural teaching of our faulty law, which for three centuries past has been trying to falsify the maxim that self-preservation is the first law of nature, and has naturally failed in the attempt. The spendthrifts of to-day, the paupers of to-morrow, are in the exercise of their strict legal rights; our blame is not for them; it is, firstly, for the law itself which is, indeed, an abstraction, and cares nothing for censure; but, secondly, for ourselves, for the nation that bears' instead of mending a law that is wrong in its principle, harsh in its practice, unjust in its execution, and un-Christian in its effects.

* The extravagant error has been made of calling this Sermon a censure of the poor. It is only just by the false classification which I have laboured to expose further on that any such preposterous conclusion can be reached. The above paragraph puts it plainly that it is *National Improvidence*, for which we are every one responsible, which my sermon assails. I do not dream of undervaluing the present gallant efforts at independence made by thousands of poor men. It is the too frequent failure of these efforts, from no fault of the men themselves, which makes me cry out. The providence of the poor, but independent-minded, working men under present circumstances, is as noble, as praiseworthy, and as wonderful to me as the improvidence of the wasteful is deplorable and sad.

This last I have to prove, in order to justify myself, as a Christian minister, for treating such a matter in the house of God.

If I have shown that individual improvidence is sinful, it follows that National Improvidence is a national sin. But I am now concerned to indicate the real moral harm it does. Firstly, it dooms thousands to degradation, misery, and joylessness, who, but for our national teaching, might be happy, self-provided, and independent. Those whom a Christian nation should encourage to "owe no man anything save to love one another," we teach to owe everything to other men and yet to hate the very people to whom they owe so much. If such exceptions be known as an indoor pauper happy, or an out-door pauper satisfied, it is not that our system is good, but that here or there a poor man or woman is better than our system.

But this is a trifle compared to the chief moral harm our pauper system works. It creates a new class in our State which confuses our whole social order, and does the work of Satan in awaking and fostering immeasurable social discords. There was a time when a fair classification might be made of all men into rich or poor, by comparison of their possessions. But such comparison implied that every man possessed something. "The poor ye have always with you," our blessed Saviour said, "and when ye will ye can do them good." But He never meant the pauper, established and endowed by law, whom our bad teaching tempts to destitution, and to whom, as a class, no good can be done. In former times the rich had much and the poor little, but there was no class created by law who in the very nature of things should possess nothing at all. And the effect of this intrusion of a new class is to produce a wrong classification, from the error of which springs the main part of all our bitter, godless class hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, and envyings.

For though the working-man, who for dear independence' sake does his Christian and social duty, and lays by a few shillings week by week, be really a rich man and a capitalist as compared to the pauper, not yet in the workhouse, who starves his wretched wife and little children while wasting his earnings in the public-house, yet these two classes have come to consider themselves as one, and to feel a common ill-will against all other ranks of men who seem securely provided. And how is it that the thrifty, honest-hearted workman submits to the dishonour of such a connection, which we should think he would repudiate with indignation? There is a sad reason for it. He knows that he has no true security for his savings or his work; that sickness and old age may come upon him; that the little store he has hoarded may be spent, the club he has trusted may fail him in his need, and he himself at last be forced to share the workhouse dole with those very thriftless paupers, whom, though without one true thought in common with him, he learns to miscall, for this unhappy reason, the men of his own class. He accepts their fellowship, their brotherhood, their discontent, their blind complainings; and feeling bitterly that something must be wrong, though unable to understand the source of the error, lays all the blame, with hasty hatred, on the classes which may, indeed, possess more money than himself, but yet have far closer sympathy with his habits, his hopes, and his aspirations than the wilful spendthrifts whom the honest working-man so blindly calls his brothers and his friends.

I have thus tried to show you the sinfulness, the prevalence, and the injury to our social peace and our Christian character caused by improvidence in general, and by our National Improvidence in particular as fostered by our well-intended but unhappy law, which, compelling the provident to support the improvident, demoralises one part of the community while robbing the other. I have tried, in the words of the text, to show you one reason why "ye have sown much and bring in little; ye eat, but ye have not enough; ye drink, but ye are not filled with drink; ye clothe you, but there is none warm, and he that earneth wages earneth wages to put them in a bag with holes." But if God lead us thus in the text to "consider our ways," it is not merely that we should see them to be wrong, but that we should study how to mend them. And, therefore, I will conclude by offering, in all sincere humility, the suggestion at least of a remedy for part of that National Improvidence which keeps us so much further than we should be from carrying out, as a nation, the declared will of God.

If our law compel at all, its compulsion should be just, and its compulsion should be wise. The nation provides now for men when they become paupers, whereas it should provide that they should not become destitute at all. A man provided securely against destitution lives a life of hopefulness; a man allowed to fall into pauperism lives a life of discontent and despair. In early manhood, when youths have only themselves to keep, they earn enough to make easy provision against want and sickness in old age. They waste that golden opportunity because they know the law will compel others to provide for them. Why not make every man bear his own burden and provide for himself? Why not apply the compulsion at the right time to the right persons, and, for their own blessing and independence sake, compel the inexperienced youths of every class to make provision in their early, easy, healthy times for need, and want, and sickness that must come as years draw on? Thus, and thus only, can we see a way to give to every man security, providence, and independence, to range us all upon one side as citizens, to prevent prodigality which no later steps can cure, to allay discontent, which no other measure can appease, to remove the stumbling-block our nation has ignorantly placed in our Christian course; to give peace for strife, plenty for want, brotherhood for hatred,

sympathy for suspicion, and even wealth itself jor woe.

My Christian brethren, I have done. Forgive me if in bringing before you an unusual subject, and offering you what may seem a startling suggestion, I have hurt any feeling, or offended any prejudice. I do not ask you to agree with me, but only to think as fellow-citizens and as fellow-Christians of what I have been bold to put before you. It is one direction in which I would ask you to apply the words of the text: "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Consider your ways." I leave the subject to your prayerful, earnest thought, convinced that you will every one be working in the cause of Christ for the good of men, in seeking for some means of uprooting from our midst that National Sin of Improvidence which is the foreigner's scoff, the statesman's perplexity, the wise man's wonder, the good man's sorrow, the just man's hate, the rich man's shame, the thrifty man's grievance, and the wasteful man's despair.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. VIII. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 10, 1880.

THE BURIALS BILL.

SOME of our correspondents have expressed surprise at the indifference of the lay members of the Church to this Bill, and one of them asks to have it explained. There can be no denying the existence of indifference, if not positive approval of the measure, when such good churchmen as Lords Selborne and Devon are seen voting for it, and in the House of Lords—no bad representative of our historical church in its lay and clerical elements—have passed the Bill. An experienced Churchwarden has endeavoured to account for the indifference, if not alienation, of the laity to the supposed interests and rights of the Clergy in this matter by the narrow-minded, sectarian and intolerant demeanour of some of the Clergy. This may account for the feeling in some few parishes, but we believe that the large majority of the laity are of opinion that the measure is demanded on the grounds of justice and expediency. Many of the Clergy regard the question as purely theological, or rather ecclesiastical; one relating—as a "Country Vicar" puts it—to the discipline of the Church, whereas it is really in part a very practical and sanitary one. Decency and the "laws of health" require that every corpse, whether of saint or sinner, should be buried; and the common law rules that every parishioner has a legal right of interment in the churchyard of which the incumbent is held to be a trustee for every parishioner, whether Churchman or Dissenter. The Dissenter complains that he cannot conscientiously avail himself of this right, in consequence of certain restrictions, the chief of which is the legal right of the incumbent to read the Church Service over his remains. The laity, many of whom are strong supporters of the Established Church, are willing, nay, anxious, that these restrictions should be abolished; and our Nonconformist neighbours granted a kind of conscience clause in the use of the churchyards as well as of other national cemeteries. Our much respected "Country Vicar" argues with a show of truth and accuracy that Dissenters, by abolishing Church-rates, "contracted themselves out of" their right to put forward their present claim, but Lawyers still maintain that their legal right has not been extinguished. No doubt the fight for the abolition of the compulsory rate was a foolish and short-sighted move on the part of Dissenters, and one of the results of this Bill may be its re-enactment. We certainly look for a considerable abatement of the rancorous hatred and venomous hostility of political Dissenters towards the Church as one of the happy results of this measure of justice and conciliation. Many think that the Dissenters, when they get the churchyards, will not rest satisfied until they get the use of the churches. Our correspondent says that the churches must follow, as a logical inference, the use of the yards. The world is not ruled by logic, and we venture to think that experience does not sanction this inference. In Ireland Roman Catholics and Protestants, and, in the North of Ireland, the Presbyterians also have for generations used the National Church-yards, which were National until Mr. Gladstone laid his sacrilegious hands upon them. Yet we never heard of the Nonconformists prefering a claim to use the Churches. Looking around our own country we see innumerable Chapels all appropriated to different sects, and nowhere is any building held in common; but the sharpest lines of theological distinctinction are drawn between the various denominations. Such a design may now be entertained, and even candidly avowed, but we do not believe that it will ever be realised in the future, that possessiou of our National Churches will be held in common by Churchmen and Dissenters. Even if there were any danger of such a consummation in future, it would not warrant the refusal of that which may at present be right and expedient. The Bill,

necessarily and unavoidably, infringes the exclusive rights of the Clergy, and we confess that we put little trust in the various amendments that have been adopted to make such infringements more palatable. Some of these amendments, if accepted by the House of Commons, will, we think, prove anything but improvements on our present Burial Service. We regard the measure as a truly Conservative one, and regret that it was not passed by the late Government. The Clergy would, we think, do well to accept it in good part and carry it out in a liberal and Christian spirit, in the hope that it may tend to increase their congregations and conciliate Dissenters. It is certainly a step, however slight, towards the re-union of Christian Churches—and we don't believe that it will lead to the desecration of what is sacred, forfeit the fees, or degrade the position of the Clergy—and prepare the way for the final overthrow of the Established Church.

—:o:—

GOOD FOOLS.

We have received remonstrances for the insertion of "Some Thoughts" on the above subject by M. A. M., and have inserted one from "A Frequent Reader" as a specimen of what such a remonstrance ought *not* to be. "Stripes are for the backs of fools," but such stripes as these our correspondent will scarcely feel. In fact, none of M. A. M.'s critics venture to say he is wrong in any of the follies he describes. As to the plain and strong language he has applied to Mr. Gladstone, certainly it is not nearly so unmeasured and abusive as that which this statesman applied to not only his political opponents, but to the whole Turkish and Austrian Nations.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE LAITY AND THE BURIALS BILL.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Mr. Bartlett has entered into rather an elaborate dissertation on the subject matter of my letter, from which it is evident that I did not make my meaning clear to him, and as I believe that he, equally with myself, has the welfare of the Church at heart; I will endeavour to explain more fully what I believe to be the reason of the so-called apathy of our laity in resisting encroachments upon the Church's privileges.

First, then, by toleration, I certainly do *not* mean what he suggests, but broadly, I take its meaning to be implied in the axiom, "Unity in Essentials, Liberty in Non-Essentials, Charity in all," and herein arises the difficulty between the typical cleric and layman of the present day, viz. as to what are Essentials or the opposite, in the conduct of the public worship of God. I cannot attempt, in a letter, to give a tithe of my own experience even; and were I to do so, I fear Mr. Bartlett would not find it edifying, but having held the office of Churchwarden, (and that not of my own seeking) during the past few years; under Rectors, who fairly represented in themselves, the two extremes of Church doctrine and practice; briefly, I have learnt this, to me most painful lesson, that the energies of the laity are being alienated to a large extent, by the intolerance of many of our parochial clergy (both Ritualistic and Evangelical) who from the vantage point of their position, act the part of the Autocrat, rather than that of St. Paul, vide 1 Cor. ix. 22; for it must be acknowledged that Church work, so far as we laymen are concerned, cannot proceed with any prospect of success, except under the auspices of the Clergy and in full communion with them; as a contrast, let me add, that it was my privilege to work some years back in the centre of London with one (now Dr. Moorhouse, Bishop of Melbourne) whose broad sympathies, unflagging energy, and resolute will seemed to carry all before it; and as a result he never lacked lay help, while hundreds of young men and boys, used his Club and Institute, and therein felt his influence before they worshipped in his Church; and thus I believe it will ever be, where our Clergy are animated by a similar spirit. In conclusion, I do not intend to continue this correspondence, much more to enter into a polemical discussion which might suggest ill-will; but can only hope that I may have touched some chord which, if true, may yet vibrate as something more than an empty sound, in the ears of the Church at large.

Epsom, July 4th, 1880. ALFRED LOW.

—:o:—

The Bishop of Bedford opened on July 2nd a new Mission church in the parish of All Saints', Clapton. The district in question is a remarkable instance of the way in which the population from the central parts of London is pouring to the outskirts. The Mission church is situate on the marsh land adjoining the River Lea, which is rapidly being covered with small houses, let out to the artisans and others who have been crowded out of the older parts of London, and have been induced by cheap and easy means of transit to settle down here. The population attached to the conventional district of All Souls' now numbers from 6,000 to 7,000 souls, and bids fair to soon double these figures. The spiritual destitution of these people had necessarily been very great. The church is a handsome iron structure, built to accommodate 400 worshippers, and was crowded, many of the poor of the district being unable to find room. The prayers were taken by the Rev. B. Meredyth Kitson, vicar of the parish; and the Lessons were read by the Rev. R. Milburn Blakiston, secretary of the Incorporated Church Building Society, and the Rev. N. E. Egremont, curate-in-charge of the Mission —the sermon being preached by the Bishop.

—o—

BURIALS BILL.

SIR,—Lord Derby is reported to have said, on the second reading of the Burials Bill:—"Most parish churches have been, if not rebuilt, at least largely repaired and restored, by the free contributions of those who worshipped in them. It could not be contended that in the case of churchyards any analogous expense had been incurred."

Unless the experience of my brethren in the ministry is different from mine, his lordship is much mistaken.

During the time I have been an incumbent, I have been privileged to take the principal part in the erection of a new church, the rebuilding of one parish church, and the restoration of another. But during the same time two new churchyards have been provided, and two

enlargements of churchyards have taken place, the land, legal expenses, and consecration fees having been freely given by members of the Church. And I am not aware that in any case a contribution was given by a Nonconformist.

While I was a curate two churches and a churchyard were provided, the latter, *I believe*, by subscriptions, but as I was only a helper, I cannot say with certainty how all the funds were raised.

G. SEARL EDSWORTH.

Croxton Kerrial Vicarage, Grantham, June 8, 1880.

—:o:—

GOOD FOOLS.

SIR, — I feel constrained to protest against the singularly foolish and indecent article which occupies the editoral place in your recent issue. I know not to whom the prefixed initials may belong, but I venture to say that, as far as one side of his topic is concerned. The description of folly, the quality of his own mind must furnish an unimpeachable qualification for his self-imposed task.

To differ honorably from Mr. Gladstone, and to oppose this or that part of his policy on rational grounds, is not only possible but easily justifiable; but for all that, he stands in the first rank of living English statesmen, and has recently been shown to have an influence in the conntry second to none. For an anonymous writer, who has either so little knowledge, or so imperfect a command of language, as not to be able to describe accurately the most recent public events, to use this stateman's name to illustrate his notions about fools and quacks, betrays such an intensity of impertinent self-conceit, as to suggest a perilously near approach to insanity. I sincerely trust that the admission of this offensive nonsense is due to an oversight; otherwise I should be tempted to say that the "Pulpit" runs the risk of falling, unwept and unforgotten, into the limbo of "weeds and worn-out faces."

A FREQUENT READER.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL, 1880.

Here is the proposed measure in the fewest words—

1. After the passing of the act every local authority (usually the School Attendance Committee of the Board of Guardians for the Union), will have *forthwith* to act as a school board, and to frame bye-laws *for every parish in their district.*

2. If after 31st December, 1880, any school district is known not to be under a code of bye-laws, one of two things will happen: either—

(1) The local authority having jurisdiction over that school district will be held to be "in default," and be superseded at the cost of the local rates by a committee appointed by the Education Department; or

(2) The Education Department will themselves frame and impose bye-laws to be in force in the defaulting district.

3. In no case is the local authority to wait, before acting, for a requisition to be received from a parish which is unprovided with bye-laws.

4. The present rule (which will be in full operation on 1st January next), whereby a child of ten years old, who has made 250 attendances a year for five years since being five years old, or has passed the Fourth Standard, is ipso facto entitled to go to work, is to be practically suspended by the regulations of the local bye-laws, which, however, whilst never demanding less, may possibly demand much more than is required by Lord Sandon's Act; and employers are especially warned, under a penalty, not to take into their employ any child between ten and thirteen years old, unless that child has obtained a certificate of having reached the standard of education fixed by a bye-law in force in the district the total or partial exemption of the children of that age from the obligation to attend school.

5. The act is not to apply to the case of children who are attending school as a condition of the continuance of relief out of tne workhouse being made to them or their parents. All such cases are still to be regulated by the acts of 1870 and 1876.

—:o:—

Reviews and Notices.

"DEEP UNTO DEEP." By the Rev. Sir Emilius Bayley, B.D., Vicar of St. John's, Paddington. London: Hatchards, Piccadilly. 1880. Pp. 384.

Although eminently of a consolatory character, this very interesting volume does not, like some others written with the same purpose, lie open to the charge of tending to encourage a hasty appropriation of the comforts to the neglect of the duties of Christianity. While the writer avoids the danger of "making sad the heart of the righteous, whom God hath not made sad" he shuns, with equal caution, that of saying "peace, peace" to such as ought to feel alarm at their state before Him. In the twenty-two chapters of which it is composed, a variety of topics is introduced; but, at the same time, there pervades the whole a unity of design, the work containing throughout frequent reference to "the deeper experiences of the Christian life." Commencing with a chapter entitled "Deep sea-sounding," the author takes occasion to notice the fact that allusions are often made, and especially in the poetical parts of the Bible, to the waters of the sea, parabolic teachings being founded upon the various aspects of the deep. In its wide expanse is found an emblem of the spread of the knowledge of the Lord among the nations of earth. Of its hidden profundities, a consolatory use is made by Micah, when alluding to the fullness of God's pardoning mercy: "Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of His heritage? He retaineth not His anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy. He will turn again; He will have compassion upon us; He will subdue our iniquities; and Thou wilt cast all our sins *into the depths of the sea.*" By the Psalmist and by the author of the Apocalypse, national tumults are compared to the rage of waters when lashed into fury by tempests. The bosoms of the guilty, agitated by the retributive actings of conscience, are compared to the "troubled sea whose waters cast up mire and dirt," while the spiritual peace which God enables those who serve Him to experience, is likened to the stillness of the ocean, in seasons of calm. This introductory chapter is full of references to the spiritual teachings of the depths of the sea and from it, the following passages are quoted, as illustrative of the practical character of the writer's design, namely, that of comforting "the feeble minded," and those who are "often in heaviness through manifold temptations." "Let it be remembered that in the deepest seas, bottom—though often sought in vain, is always found at last,—so there are no depths of Christian trial which are not, sooner or later, proved to be

fathomable. There *is* firm ground beneath your feet, if you can only reach it. So far from being exposed to superhuman difficulties, 'there hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man,' *i.e.*, adapted to man, and therefore within the power of human endurance. . . . "From the entire absence of sunlight in the abysmal depths, it might be expected, as has been found to be the case, that creatures which live there are destitute of the powers of vision. But there are exceptions to this rule. In some, the organs of sight have been discovered, proving that light must reach these abysses, from some source or other, and that, even there, the darkness is not absolute. May not this interesting fact suggest to us what is doubtless true, that the spiritual darkness of the Christian is never wholly devoid of light, and that in our seasons of deepest gloom it may be truly said of us, 'Blessed are your eyes for they see, and your ears for they hear.'" Chapter the second, "'Out of the depths,'" presents the reader with an instructive classification of suffering, that of *chastisement*, of *trial or probation*, and of *testimony*. In addition to the infliction of suffering for *chastisement, and for trial and probation*, there is, the writer says, a suffering for *testimony*. "God may be honoured by the witness-bearing of His servants. . . . The Christian proves, thus, to others, to a scoffing world, to a grieved and sorrowing Church, the power of that faith which sustains, and that hope which animates him."

There is much Christian philosophy in the chapters which follow under the titles, "The Hold of Sin;" "The Parable of Pain;" "Bereavement," (in which the author makes some valuable observations upon the miracle of the raising of Lazarus); and "Desolation." That which follows next, called "The Depths of Satan," deals with the subject of the personality of the Tempter, and his direct or indirect influence upon mankind. The Church of England is, it is shewn, thoroughly at one with Holy Scripture in its teaching upon the momentous subject of the existence and baneful influence of the adversary of souls. It is a part of the pledge which she demands of us at Baptism, that we should "renounce the Devil and all his works;" and she expressly declares in her Litany that there are "crafts," "assaults," to which he has recourse in his malignant designs upon man; while she teaches her members to pray that Satan may be finally beaten down under their feet. Antinomianism is described in this chapter to be (as it truly is) one of the "*depths of Satan.*" "It was by the lie of Antinomianism that Satan wrought such havoc among the early Christians." . . "He sought to persuade them that they might combine purity of doctrine with impurity of life, yea, that those who believe in Christ were so entirely delivered from the law, as to be no longer bound to observe its precepts." The author has not omitted to notice some of those "*depths of Satan*" of which Christendom in the present age presents melancholy examples. "The scientific liberalism" which seeks to undermine the foundations of Christian belief; the presumption with which the works of God in the kingdom of nature are used in the endeavour, as vain as it is sinful, to shake belief in His Word, and lead men to deny the authority of revelation; these "signs of the times," the writer says, are enough to "put us on our guard," and to show the necessity of "putting on the whole armour of God, that we may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil." In the chapters on "Typical sorrow," the trials of Job, Jeremiah, the earlier and the later Psalm-writers, the Virgin Mary, Saint Peter and Saint Paul, and Saint John the Apostle, are passed in succession before the "mind's-eye" of the reader, and practical applications made of their respective cases, as furnishing lessons of instruction to the Church, in every age. Perhaps, the most carefully and effectively-written chapter in the work is that upon the sufferings of Him who was emphatically *the* "Man of Sorrows;" and among its concluding paragraphs occur these forcible passages: "Let heaven have caused what change it may in the condition of the Redeemer, let His glorified humanity be never so far removed from the humanity of earth, the heart of Jesus remains for ever the same." . . "The omniscience of Deity conveys to the humanity of Christ the knowledge of every movement which takes place in the souls of His people; nothing is beyond His observation, nothing is beneath His care, and we may be well assured that a feeling of loving sympathy is excited within Him by every trial, by every temptation, by every sorrow, which befalls the most insignificant member of His universal flock." The connection between present suffering and the glory which is "to be revealed," is traced in this eighteenth chapter; while into those which follow, "No Separation," "Untrodden Paths," "The Silence of the Soul," and "The Stillness of the Great Deep" (the concluding one of the series), there is compressed a great amount of comfort drawn from Scriptural sources, to console the believer under the experiences of suffering which are incidental to the life "hid with Christ in God." The work which Sir Emilius Bayley has written under the title standing at the head of this notice, is of that practical and useful character which might be expected from the author of such valuable contributions to our religious literature as "Thorough," and "The Christian Life." It is to be hoped that he may long continue to find time, amidst numerous professional engagements, to give attention to the preparation of works for the press.

———:o:———

"The Threefold Sonship of Christ." By the Very Rev. Daniel Bagot, D.D. London: William Poole, Paternoster-row. Pp. 21.

With the writer of this philological essay, the subject of our Lord's Divine nature has been, for a considerable time, a favourite study. When connected with a parish in the north of Ireland, he engaged in a controversy with an eminent Unitarian minister, who soon found that he had entered the lists with a champion well furnished for polemic encounter. The present writer was informed by Dr. Bagot, shortly after the termination of the controversy, that he constrained his opponent to subserve his purpose in no slight degree by marking out for him a line of argument. The Unitarian disputant stated, at the outset of the discussion, that he would assume, as granted, the Divinity of the Father. His opponent, however, told him that he had determined not to admit anything during the controversy without proof, and demanded that such be given to establish the doctrine of the Godhead of the First Person. Text after text having been brought forward by the Unitarian, Dr. Bagot then entered upon the arguments by which he established his position that "such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such the Holy Ghost:" contending that with reference to each of the Persons, statements are made by each of the inspired writers which are inexplicable on the Unitarian hypothesis. The essay which Dean Bagot has written under the above title, is an exposition of St. Paul's statement in Romans, I., 3, 4. The authorized version does

not, in Dr. Bagot's opinion, fully express the meaning and force of the original, which he translates as follows: "Separated unto the Gospel of God, which is concerning Jesus Christ our Lord, *who was* His own Son, *who was made* of the seed of David, according to the flesh, *who was declared* to be *a* Son of God, according to the "Spirit of holiness by the power of His resurrection *from amongst* the dead." *Three* assertions are made, he says, in this passage for the purpose of stating what our Lord was, in *three* points of view. The peculiarity of the Sonship of the Redeemer is denoted and implied in the phrase *His own* son, in which the pronoun is emphatic. The expression *His own* refers, he contends, to the "possession of uncreated Deity in common with the Father." "This indeed," he continues, "follows necessarily from the peculiarity of His Sonship, for if He was *only a created* Son, where could there be any foundation for this peculiarity?" The second clause of the passage is shown to attribute to Christ a *second* Sonship, which He had, as being one of the descendants of David, or, in other words, in regard of His human nature, being made "very man of the substance of His Virgin-mother." That assumption of the human nature was *His own* act, as the Eternal Word. And here the writer affirms that Chalmers, in his lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, is not correct in his statement that "it was through the operation of the Holy Spirit that the Divine nature was infused into the human, at the birth of Jesus Christ." Doubtless, it was by that operation that His humanity was produced out of the substance of her of whom He was miraculously born, and it was in consequence of that operation that "the holy thing thus born was called, not *the* but '*a* Son of God.'" But we are not, Dr. Bagot says, to lose sight of the doctrinal fact that the assumption of that human nature was the voluntary act of the LOGOS HIMSELF, and, in proof, he quotes from the Epistles of the Philippians and the Hebrews, "He *took upon Him* the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of man." "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood He Himself likewise took part of the same." In his interpretation of the third clause of the passage "declared to be *a* son of God, according to the Spirit of holiness by the power of His Resurrection from among the dead," the author declares himself opposed to the generally-adopted practice of applying the words to His Divine nature of our Lord, and contends that it was St. Paul's design to attribute to Him a *third* kind of Sonship, that is, a moral and spiritual Sonship, one which He possesses as man, in common with all His true disciples, with however this difference, that what exists only in different degrees in His followers, those degrees varying according to their progressive advancement in spiritual life, exist in Him in perfection as the Being of whom it is written that He is "holy, harmless, and undefiled, and separate from sinners." The Sonship here referred to is not, according to Dr. Bagot's interpretation, one peculiar to Himself, as is His Sonship in the sense to which the first clause has reference, but a *spiritual* Sonship which He possesses in common with others who believe in Him, and that Sonship has been "declared" or "proved" by the power of His Resurrection *from among* the dead, the word in the original for "power" Dr. Bagot connects not, as is generally done with the "declaring" or "proving" Christ to be *a* Son of God by His Resurrection (as if it were the purpose of St. Paul to say that Christ was declared with power, or powerfully declared to be a Son of God by that event,) but with the latter words of the passage thus "by the power of His Resurrection," "the fact" he says "of this having been the subject of a special resurrection, was a vindication and proof of His spiritual Sonship." There is also to be observed, he contends, a difference of meaning in the two forms of expression, that in which the original of the preposition *from* is not used, and that in which it is, although Professor Stewart, of Andover, and other philologists consider them synonymous. "There is a very great and important difference," says Dr. Bagot, one denotes a rising from the dead in a *general* sense, the other a *special* resurrection, in which one or more rise *from amongst the dead*, leaving others behind them. None but those who are Sons of God have part in a special resurrection. The resurrection of those who are Christ's "at His coming" is that which is called in Revelation xx. 6 "the first resurrection," and the fact of their being the subjects of this, proves them to be Sons of God, and therefore this "first resurrection" is called in Romans viii. 19 "the manifestation of the Sons of God," or that which makes it manifest that they are such. Christ was the subject of a special resurrection from amongst the dead, which proved Him by a powerful demonstation to be a Son of God as regarded the Spirit of holiness which was in Him.

This is what the writer believes to be the true meaning of a passage which has so long and so greatly perplexed commentators, and he submits it to the consideration of those interested in Biblical exegesis believing that whatever tends to throw light upon the character of the Divine Head of the Church, cannot be considered uncalled-for or irrelevant.

The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury will re-assemble for the despatch of business on Tuesday, the 13th inst., at Westminster. "Resolutions" will, it is stated, be moved in the Canterbury Convocation:—

"1. That a committee be appointed to venture to prepare a bill to be submitted to Parliament for dealing with moral offences committed by Bishops and clergy."

"2. That a committee be appointed to venture to prepare a bill to be submitted to Parliament to empower a Bishop, when a commission shall have reported that a curate is needed in any parish, to assign a larger stipend than is at present allowed."

The Earl of Mulgrave will preach at the anniversary of the Church Defence Institution on the 27th inst., when the Offertory will be given to the Mansion-house Truro Cathedral Fund. The Lord Mayor will attend in state. The service will be at St. Michael's, Cornhill, at 1.15 p.m.

The clergy and churchwardens of the deanery and peculiar of Masham with Kirkby Malzeard, in Chapter assembled, have sent to the Bishop of Ripon a memorial expressing their grief and dismay at the prospect of a bill passing into law whereby schismatic intrusion into consecrated churchyards will be legalised, such as has never been known in England since the shameful days of anarchy and rebellion in the seventeenth century. They add that they are unable to conceal their regret and disappointment that his lordship's vote was not recorded in opposition to the measure.

"In deep dejection and distress they seek your fatherly counsel and comfort. And while they deem it their duty by sad and earnest protest to deliver their own souls of all complicity or assent, tacit or overt, in such sacrilegious insult and spoliation, they venture humbly to beseech you to take all such steps, in concert

with others, the right reverend fathers of the Church, as shall to your and their wisdom seem best calculated to save her honour in this projected humiliation and outrage. And in the meanwhile they venture to pray your lordship to refuse, in all cases and at all hazards, to consecrate any fresh churchyards, or any additions to old churchyards, subjected as these will necessarily be to desecration by unordained and unauthorised ministrations. And that God will direct all your counsels to His glory, and so order the course of this world that His Church may serve Him in all godly quietness, they will ever pray."

The question of the relations of the Church and Dissent is to come off before the Leicester Church Congress in the following form—"The responsibillity of the Church towards Dissent, with special regard to Home Reunion." The subject will be introduced by the Dean of Peterborough and Archdeacon Watkins in papers, and Earl Nelson, the Bishop of Liverpool, and Professor Plumptre will speak upon it. The Cathedral System, "how to reform it, so as to strengthen the relations of the cathedral to the diocese, and to make each cathedral a more efficient centre of religious activity," is to be dealt with by the Bishop of Truro, the Rev. Canon Trevor, the Rev. W. M. Campion, Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P., and Mr. Magniac, M.P.

A meeting of the Deans Rural of the archdeaconry of Totnes convened by Archdeacon Erle, has been held at Plymouth, to discuss the Burials Bill. The Rural Deans were accompanied by three members from each of the several Chapters. The Archdeacon presided; and, after a very full and animated discussion, the following resolutions were carried by 23 to 2 :—

"That this meeting desires respectfully but solemnly to protest against the principle of the Burials Bill now before the Houses of Parliament."

"That, in the event of the bill unhappily becoming law, and subject to our solemn protest against the principle of the bill, this meeting expresses the hope that—(1) Lord Mount-Edgcumbe's amendment will be retained [carried by 16 to 2]. (2) That the Bishop of Winchester's amendment, limiting services under the bill to thirty minutes, will be adopted [14 to 2]. (3) That the exclusion of all Sundays, Christmas days, and Good Fridaays from the operation of the bill be maintained [*nem con.*]."

It was also decided unanimously, at the close of the meeting, that a copy of the above protest and resolutions should be sent also to the Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe, in acknowledgment of his valuable services in endeavouring to ameliorate the conditions of the bill.

To the Bishop of Lincoln, on the other hand, the same Chapter have expressed their thankful admiration of the noble, but ineffectual, resistance offered by him to the Bill. Bishop Wordsworth has replied :—

"Riseholme, Lincoln, July 1, 1880.

My dear Sir—I beg you to accept for yourself, and to convey to the memorialists on behalf of whom you write as Rural Dean, my respectful thanks for the address received from you this morning. I join with you and with them in hearty prayer to Almighty God that He may be pleased to defend His Church in this the time of her distress, and to deliver the realm of England from the sins of sacrilege and profaneness, and from those heavy national chastisements which they entail. If this should not be His will we may at least derive comfort for the deliverance of our own souls from complicity with these sins; and from looking upward to the Church triumphant and glorified, which no earthly powers can assail.—I am, dear Mr. Gorham, your faithful and obliged, C. LINCOLN.

———o———

The sentence of sequestration pronounced two years ago by Lord Penzance against Mr. Mackonochie was published on Sunday morning by Mr. Thomas, representative of Mr. J. B. Lee, the registrar, affixing the document, signed by the Bishop, appointing as sequestrator Mr. H. W. Lee, to the door of St. Alban's. Shortly after, the congregation who had attended the nine o'clock celebration, left the church, and the doorkeeper requested Mr. Thomas to leave, as the place where he was standing, at the south door, was private property, but Mr. Thomas said he would go over the threshold of the church and wait there until the commencement of Morning Prayer a few minutes latter. At this several of the clergy attached to the church, together with others, came to the door and inspected the documents, at which, says the *Daily News*, they laughed. "They then retired, and the same attendant who had previously spoken upon the subject of private ground requested Mr. Thomas to leave the porch of the church, as he was causing an obstruction by persons assembling. This Mr. Thomas declined to do, pointing out that if there was any disturbence it would not be of his creation. Just at this moment, Mr. Warr, one of the churchwardens, came up and said he acknowledged the document had been fixed, and that he would not have any objection or altercation in the porch. To this Mr. Thomas replied that as soon as service commenced, in five minutes' time, he would remove the parchment and leave the copy. After a short argument Mr. Warr retired, and directly afterwards some half-dozen boys rushed up the passage. One of them cried out, 'May we pull it down, sir?' to which a voice from the porch answered, 'You can if you like.' In other instant both documents were upon the ground, and the lads ran off, an attempt by a bystander to catch one being prevented by two or three onlookers. Mr. Thomas picked up the parchment and proceeded into the church to fold it up, when a young member of the congregation, whose zeal outran his discretion, tore it from his hands, shouting that he 'would not have the house of God desecrated.' Mr. Thomas adroitly recovered the document, but was promptly ejected from the church, as was an unfortuate gentleman who was mistaken to be a friend, but who had nothing to do with the matter. Some excitement prevailed, as the youth who had rendered himself so inopportunely aggressive declared 'if they went in again he would put them out again,' and further threatened 'to fetch half a dozen medical students up to clear the place.' A policeman was sent for, and in due course arrived, and with him the churchwardens, who, however, declined to give the registrar's clerk in charge for brawling, as had been suggested. Some conversation ensued as to the notice having been put upon the wrong door, and it not being a legal service; but the churchwarden said he was quite satisfied, and Mr. Thomas then left, the copy of the document wnich had been torn off the door being taken to the clergy-house. It had been announced that Mr. Mackonochie would preach at St. Peter's, Dockhead; but in consideration of the fresh feature put upon the case he altered his arrangements, and assisted in the service at eleven o'clock, preaching the sermon from the Gospel of the day, but without making the slightest allusion to the topic of the sequestration."

On Thursday Bishop Ryle was solemnly enthroned in his pro-cathedral, St. Peter's, Liverpool, which was crowded to its utmost capacity on the occasion. The right rev. prelate was accompanied by Viscount Sandon, M.P., the High Sheriff, the members of the Bishopric Committee, the Mayor and corporation (in state), about three hundred of the clergy in surplices, the officials of the diocese, and Rouge Croix, Mr. Stephen Tucker. In the absence of the Bishop of Chester through indisposition, Archdeacon Jones conducted the ceremony. As the procession entered the church the Hallelujah Chorus was sung, and was followed by the *Te Deum*. At its close the Bishop, advancing towards the Archdeacon, produced the Letters Patent and mandate of the Archbishop of York directing his installation. In the unavoidable absence of Mr. Egerton Vernon Harcourt, Principal Registrar of the province of York, the Letters Patent were read by Mr. Hassard. The reading concluded, Rouge Croix said, "God save the Queen," and presented the grant of arms for the see to the Archdeacon, the organ playing as he did so the National Anthem. The Letters Patent and the grant of arms having been deposited by the Archdeacon upon the communion-table, the mandate of the Archbishop of York for the installation and enthronement of the Bishop of Liverpool was handed to the venerable gentleman, who expressed his readiness to "show regard to it" upon the Bishop taking "the oath usual in such cases." His lordship then took the oath of fidelity, and he was conducted to the Episcopal throne by the Archdeacon, duly enthroned, and inducted "into the real, actual, and corporal possession of the bishopric of Liverpool, and of all its rights, privileges, and appurtenances whatsoever." At the close of the prayers which followed, the Dean of Chester preached an eloquent sermon from Acts v. 20:—"There was a tone of remarkable cheerfulness in the early part of the Apostles' days. It was like the beginning of a prosperous voyage—the sky was bright, the wind was fair, the sails were set, and the progress was rapid. They did well to mark this character of the earliest Church history, and to connect the principles of it with their present meeting. There had been much to encourage them in the course of circumstances which had brought them to that day. Anything like vain exultation and self-satisfaction because that moment was one of congratulation would be a serious mistake; the Bishop would perhaps tell him to use stronger language, and say it would be a great imprudence and grevious sin. Moreover, the sky would not always be bright. The heavens were sure to be overcast; the storms were sure to come. In the present day the press was most truly a pulpit, and he was bound to say that the Bishop selected for that new see had been largely blessed in the circulation of his printed words. There must be no reserve and no restriction in preaching the Gospel. He trusted that the Bishop of Liverpool would single out for special attention the young men of that city. There had been far too much debating and contention in that community. They might hope that a spirit of co-operation would be graciously diffused over the community from a centre which had authority, and words of cheer to the struggling and desponding clergyman, who had great difficulties to contend against. He hoped the time was not far distant when a noble cathedral worthy of Liverpool would be the outward expression of their diocesan life." At the close of the service the procession was re-formed, and the Bishop, the Archdeacon, Lord Sandon, and the Mayor and Corporation, returned to the City Hall. In the evening the Mayor entertained a large company at a banquet in the City Hall, and the Bishop afterwards held a reception, which was numerously attended. A number of Nonconformists, chiefly Wesleyans, have presented Bishop Ryle with an address expressive of their goodwill.

When Lord Alwyne Compton was promoted to the Deanery of Worcester, the Northamptonshire Education Society met and unanimously resolved that some recognition of his lordship's valuable services to the diocese should be made. At the particular desire of Lord Alwyne, this took the form of a simple address, which, with a volume containing the signatures of more than two hundred of the clergy and laity of the counties of Northampton and Rutland, was presented to him at the Deanery on Thursday, the 24th ult. A more eloquent and appropriate tribute to many years' self-sacrificing labour, and, at the same time, conclusive testimony to the recipient's widespread popularity, cannot well be imagined.—*Northampton Herald.*

:o:

BOOKS, &c., RECEIVED.

Daniel Moore: "The Christian." Cassell and Co.
Sir. E. Bayley: "Deep unto Deep." Hatchards'.
Dean Bagot: "The Three-fold Sonship of Christ." William Poole.
Hessey: "Some Questions of the Day." Scott.
Calthrop: Christian Certainties." Eliot Stock.
Maclaren: "Life of David." Macniven & Wallace.
"Churchman," for July: Eliot Stock.
"Clergyman's Magazine": Hodder & Stoughton.
"Good Words": Isbister and Co.
"Sunday Magazine": Isbister and Co.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Atkinson, Rev. Edmund Willes, rector of Harswell.
Booth, Rev. William, vicar of Hook.
Burrows, Rev. John Nelson, curate of St. Stephen's, Haggerston; vicar of St. Augustine's, Haggerston.
Cattley, Rev. Richard, honorary canon of Worcester Cathedral.
Gibson, Rev. Edgar Charles Sumner, prebendary of Combe Fifteenth in Wells Cathedral.
Lewis, Rev. A fred Merlin, vicar of Huttons Ambo.
Orr, Rev. William Holmes, rector of West Lydford.
Pearson, Rev. Alfred, rector of St. Ebbe's, Oxford; vicar of All Saints', Nottingham.
Pitcher, Rev. Amos William, rector of Keinton Mandeville.
Sandford, Rev. G., vicar of Ecclesall, Sheffield.
Stewart, Rev. W. A., vicar of West Tisted, Alresford.
Torr, Rev. William Edward, vicar of Flamstead; vicar of Eastham, Cheshire.
Williamson, Rev. Zaccheus Paynter, perpetual curate of Margam, Glamorganshire.

:o:

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Boyce, Rev. Henry Le Grand, at Aslacton Vicarage, Norfolk, Vicar of Aslacton, on the 2nd inst., aged 67.
Fawcett, Rev. Christopher, at Somerford Keynes, Wilts, on the 14th inst., aged 78.
Snepp, Rev. Charles Busbridge, at Percy Villa, vicar of Perry Barr, near Birmingham, on the 23rd ult.
Sutton, Rev. James, M.A., at Rosliston Vicarage, Burton-on-Trent, on the 15th inst., aged 51.
Wright, Rev. William S., at North Gosford, Northumberland, vicar of the parish, on the 4th inst, aged 43.
Young, Rev. Thomas Drake, at St. Matthew's Vicarage, Suttonbridge, Lincolnshire, forty years incumbent of the parish, on the 1st inst., aged 71.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CHRISTIANITY INEXPLICABLE BY NATURAL CAUSES.

By the Ven. ARCHDEACON REICHEL, D.D.,
Canon of St. Patrick's, and
Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin.

Sermon Preached at All Souls', Langham Place, on Sunday, July 4th, 1880.

"It this counsel or this work be of man, it will come to nought."—Acts, v. 38.

THE subject I have undertaken to deal with this afternoon is, the impossibility of accounting for the rise of Christianity on purely natural grounds,—in other words, the impossibility of its being other than a true religion in its historic aspect as involving supernatural facts.

It is remarkable that the greatest historian that ever wrote has evaded dealing with this question. In the celebrated 15th Chapter of his immortal work, Gibbon, whilst ingeniously adducing all the collateral causes which may have contributed to the final triumph of Christianity, never once even notices the difficulty of accounting for its origin. His subject, indeed, led him to take up Christianity as it existed in the times of the Antonines; with its rise a century before he may have been glad to be excused from dealing.

Things could not, however, be left in this state: and the learning of German Professors, animated by the wish to have something new for youthful audiences, and unchecked by that practical sense for which German Universities used to give little scope, was enlisted in the cause of Naturalism. The wild theories of the Tübingen School, imported into France by a writer pre-eminently fitted to give them vogue, have been lately developed by him to admiring and sympathetic audiences in this capital. And, as the Hibbert Lectures involve their author's whole system, and as M. Renan is, if not the ablest, yet certainly the most elegant expositor of that phase of thought which patronises religion in the abstract while denying the truth of any religion in particular, my object may perhaps be best attained by examining the theory of the rise and early progress of the Christianity which he has put before the world as a satisfactory substitute for belief in its miraculous character and claims. For certainly, all that can be effected by great (though not always accurate) learning, wonderful ingenuity, and exquisite taste, has been done in this case. The problem has been repeatedly attempted: if even M. Renan fails in dealing with it, we may well deem it insoluble.

Taken in broad outline, M. Renan's representation of the "Origins" of Christianity, is pretty much what I shall now lay before you:—

Christianity, as conceived by the Person who has given it little more than its name, was merely a partial and unpractical, though elevated, morality. It was rather a sentiment than a system. Of his own place and function, Jesus would seem to have had no definite idea: at least his views varied, as did his practice, with the advance of his career. Beginning as a mere Jewish Rabbi, with that measure of inspiration which every true-hearted worshipper of the Supreme may expect and claim, he gradually rose to loftier and more visionary notions about himself, and became less pure in his methods of advancing his pretensions. He even condescended to pose as a Thaumaturge, it is M. Renan's own word, and I hardly like to try to translate it into plain English. Irritated and exasperated by the opposition he very naturally and justifiably encountered, his gentle enthusiasm gradually deepened into a fanaticism in which he began to assert himself as a nondescript Superhuman Being, destined hereafter to play the part of Universal Judge. His death of calculated ignominy might have put an end to a sect or school which was held together by nothing but personal attachment to a Teacher who had taught nothing definite: but some whisper of the wind during one of their terrified nightly gatherings immediately after his execution concurred with the hysteric exaltation of a female devotee whom the Master had rescued from a life of sin and shame, in representing him to the disciples as being, after all, alive. Returning home to Galilee, they resumed the trade of fishermen by which they would from henceforth have to earn their bread, as the contributions on which they, together with the Master, had hitherto lived, were dried up by his death: and whilst engaged in an outdoor occupation so eminently favourable to hysteric illusion, they repeatedly fancied that they heard the accents of the beloved voice or saw the beloved form, sometimes whilst in their boat, sometimes on the shore, as they cooked and ate their frugal meal. When these apparitions at length ceased, it was ascribed to their Master's having withdrawn into heaven: and stories of his visible Ascension were soon circulated. Their conversations with the risen Saviour; the breathing on them with the awful words "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye remit they are remitted, whose sins ye retain they are retained:" the exhibition of the nail-prints and the spear-wound to the least credulous of their number,—are all relegated to the limbo of fable, or more properly invention, in common with the legends of Lourdes and La Salette. With like "gaiety of heart" the disappearance of the Saviour's body is accounted for: the disciples stole it (though how, after doing so, they could believe in his resurrection is not explained:) or the owner of the

tomb into which it had been hastily intruded might have removed it, perhaps to the Vale of Hinnom, to be torn by dogs or burnt as carrion.

By this series of mistakes, or myths, or legends, or impostures, (I give you a choice of names, because I cannot find any English word exactly answering M. Renan's conception) a series so affectionately beautiful that one can hardly quarrel with their falsehood, (it is curious, by the way, how the moral sense seems to evaporate in the ecstatic contemplation of the beautiful) all the followers of Jesus were at once exalted into ardent and successful preachers of His name. What before His death they had not had the least power of conceiving, they now at once believed with the utmost pertinacity, forming even some kind of system, (though what it was we are not exactly told) in which their Master's Resurrection held a leading place: and this system, to add to the marvel, they forthwith proclaimed, not in Galilee, where they were at home, and which had been the chief seat of their Master's activity and popularity, but at Jerusalem, the very place where Jesus had been least appreciated, and where His enemies possessed all the power required to expose the mistakes and to crush the efforts of His disciples, and which they therefore naturally selected as the place most suitable for the establishment of the new religion: and they proclaimed it, too, with such effect, that in a few years after the memorable crucifixion, after one or two ineffectual attempts to put it down, the authorities were glad to compromise matters with the almost deified Malefactor and the thousands of His devoted following.

But the religion of Christ, whatever it was, had it been left exclusively to their conceptions, would have remained a merely Jewish sect, and would soon have been re-absorbed into Judaism. Its emancipation and consequent permanence were brought about, strange to say, not by a Gentile, outside the sacred nation, and naturally anxious to share its blessings, but by a Hebrew of the Hebrews: a Pharisee, and one of the most rancorous opponents of the new sect. This person was rapidly attaining eminence by his conservative zeal: he had persecuted the sectaries in Jerusalem, and he was on his way to Damascus to persecute them there, armed with a commission which attests his rising consequence. All of a sudden, a flash of lightning, or a sunstroke, or an instantaneous attack of fever, revolutionised this man's sentiments and character; turning him from a narrow and persecuting traditionist into the large-minded portrayer of the most exquisite ideal of charity the world has ever been enriched with. In the delirium produced by one or the other of these purely natural causes, Paul fancied he actually saw the Crucified; and as his mind already misgave him, perhaps compassionating the sufferings to which he had so much contributed, he at once veered round, becoming convinced, not only that Jesus had been wrongfully put to death, which was probably felt by thousands who never believed on him, but, which is altogether different, that he was the very Messiah whom all Israel was eagerly expecting, though in order to accept Him in this character Paul had to change his every conception of the nature of that Messiah's kingdom; and not merely this, but that he was something utterly beyond the Jewish Messiah; no less a Personage than the Son of God Himself; a Being so exalted that it is difficult to distinguish between the epithets Paul lavishes on Him, and those he assigns to the Deity. This extraordinary man—converted by delirium—recollecting all that has gone through his mind during delirium—changed in character by delirium,—and of whose personal appearance M. Renan can give an accurate sketch from sources so trustworthy as a fiction of the second Century, and a historian of the fifth,—this man, not least extraordinary, you will perhaps say, in having at length found so extraordinary a biographer, instantly begins to preach Him whom he had just before vilified; and in spite of every prejudice of birth and education, to preach Him with a wider scope than any Jew, even Jesus Himself, had ever ventured to conceive. If Jews would not listen to him, he would go to Gentiles; nor this alone; in his zeal to bring them into the fold of the Crucified and Risen One, he would not delay their entering by requiring them first to conform to the Law of Moses. They should be Christians without becoming Jews first; nay, he went so far as to forbid their becoming Jews; thereby blaspheming the Law in the estimation of the older apostles, and incurring their most uncompromising hostility. Hence an irreconcileable schism between him and them, between his disciples and their's, "a schism," to use M. Renan's own words, "so profound, that all the differences which now separate the orthodox, and the heretics, and the schismatics of the whole world, are nothing in comparison with the differences of sentiment between Peter and Paul." Of course if the accounts not merely of the book of Acts, but of Paul himself in his letter to the Galatians, lead to an altogether different conclusion to that which I have placed before you in its author's own words, they are summarily dismissed as misrepresentations, deliberately made for the purpose of creating a false impression. Whether Paul could hope to make the Galatians believe that he and Peter were really on the best of terms, thoroughly agreed in fact, when there were actually differences between them so vast as those M. Renan fancies,—whether misrepresentation so gross as this, if he did attempt it, be consistent with any respect for the character of Paul, are questions which must be left to the good sense and good feeling of the average mind of man.

Having once got so far, the next steps are more easy. It was of course inevitable that Christianity should at length reach Rome; that cesspool, as Tacitus calls it, into which flowed all strange and monstrous superstitions and practices. But Christianity reached Rome, we are now told, in two

unmingled and unmingling streams: the pure undogmatic Christianity of Peter, and the altogether different Christianity of Paul. How these can have co-existed elsewhere we are not told; but at Rome two distinct and even hostile Churches were thus founded and flourished for years side by side, and when they did at length coalesce, a third and quite different thing, the Church of Rome, as known to history and not existing in the inner consciousness of the philosopher, proceeded from their fusion. Hence the union in the Roman Church of the large views of Pauline Hellenism, with the hierarchic and sacerdotal principles of Petrine Judaism: the absence of all trace of which sacerdotal and hierarchic principles in the 1st Epistle of St. Peter of course stamps that document, hitherto universally accepted, as a forgery. And when the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple for ever extinguished the position which the theocratic capital had held during the first four decades of Christianity, the Church of Rome, in consequence of this union, succeeded to its prerogative, and its bishop became what the bishop of Jerusalem would otherwise have been, the universal Pope of Christendom. And the letter of brotherly advice written by Clement on behalf of the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth, at the end of the first century, a letter in which the writer's name does not once occur, is thus the legitimate precursor of the imperious declaration with which a French Cardinal lately astonished the Senate, "My clergy are my regiment, and must march where I bid them."

Such is the theory by which M. Renan accounts for the rise and early progress of Christianity without the aid of miracle. Let us look at a few of its difficulties, and then examine the basis on which it rests.

And first, let me call your attention to the character of Christ as it is necessary for M. Renan to present it. What was the object Jesus had in view? What did He expect to accomplish? What was the purpose of His life? Or had He any? What was the character he really claimed? All these points the new Life of Jesus leaves in bewildering uncertainty. Again: what are we to think of His miracles? M. Renan has too clear a perception of the historic value of the Gospels, in spite of all he can do to minimise it, for this purpose laying very undue stress on some absurd expressions of the silliest of the old Christian writers, Papias, to be able to say that the miracles ascribed to Jesus are mere legends devised long afterwards: yet his theory assumes the impossibility of miracles: is built, in fact, on that assumption. This leaves him in the awkward predicament that, whilst he cannot deny that Jesus claimed supernatural powers, he yet cannot acknowledge that He possessed them. He has too much good taste to call Him, in plain language, an impostor, and yet he knows not how to avoid the cruel necessity of treating Him as one. This is a point which unbelievers of the school of the late John Stuart Mill should carefully attend to. Mill fancied you could at once strip off the miraculous from the natural in the history of Christ without damage to the latter. Renan knows better; he feels that they are inseparable, and is perplexed accordingly. So this Man, who spake as man never spake before or since; this Man, whose character and words are altogether beyond the invention of His disciples, as Mill well saw; this Man, whose native and untutored wisdom accomplished what all the sages of former days had vainly attempted in the realm of practical morals; this Man, who might well deserve to be called the Son of God, if we were sure of there being a God, becomes in Renan's hands the strangest, the most unreal mixture of superhuman wisdom and crazed fanaticism, of the loftiest aspirations and the meanest deceit: allowing things to pass for miracles which he knew were not miraculous, using what M. Renan (an ex-seminarist here as in other matters) calls "innocent artifices," in order to gain ascendancy over his followers: now a sage, at whose feet mankind may well be content to sit; now a thaumaturge, trading on the credulity of his countrymen; a monster of a character suited not to the realities of life, but to the distempered imaginations of an age and a country in which M. Victor Hugo passes for a philosopher, and M. Renan for an historian.

It is, indeed, most instructive to watch the turnings and windings to which the expounder of this theory is driven in order to get rid of the *miracles* of Christ without blasting the *character* of Christ. For a lower estimate of that character than every plain reader of the Gospels naturally forms, he tries to prepare us by talking of the Oriental standard of truth as differing from our own. But the Jews were honourably distinguished from other Orientals on this very point. They did not think that success consecrates deceit; their God was a God who "required truth in the inward parts;" and in the Apocalypse, the most Jewish portion of the New Testament, there is nothing more vehemently reiterated than the damnation of "every one that loveth and maketh a lie." Distrusting, then, this method, M. Renan faintly hints that Jesus was forced into the line of miracles against his will by the spirit of the age and the expectations of his hearers. But if miracles were required by the spirit of the age, how is it that no miracle was ever ascribed to John the Baptist, a man whose immediate influence seems to have far exceeded Christ's? And if Jesus were victimised into becoming a thaumaturge, why did He appeal to miracles, as He does not only in the last but in the synoptic Gospels? "Go and tell John the things that ye do hear and see." Is this the language of a man who only half believes in the reality of something into which he is coerced by the spirit of the age? Nor were the Jews so credulous, in spite of Horace and M. Renan. The great Shemitic race, of which they are a branch, has ever been distinguished for sceptical shrewdness; and when Mohammed addressed another branch of it, the Arabs, he never

durst attempt a miracle, though they were constantly goading him to do so. How instantly they would have detected, and how contemptuously they would have received a false miracle may be seen in the shouts of laughter with which they greeted the tentative account of the prophet's night journey to heaven on Alborak. Yet what Mohammed durst not attempt in the Arabian peninsula, unchecked by the presence of any alien power, of any alien civilisation, we are now asked to believe that Jesus succeeded in effecting in Judæa, in the face of Roman occupation, in the full blaze of the most sceptical civilisation, both Roman and Sadducean, that the world has ever seen!

Passing on from the insoluble difficulty created by the inseparable interweaving of the miraculous in the history and character of Christ, let us now examine more closely the difficulty of setting up His religion after His death.

"Whatever else may be doubted," says Volkmar, one of the most sceptical of Germans, "of one thing there is no doubt, and that is, that the Apostles believed they had seen their Master alive after His death." Nothing else than this strong conviction can explain their action; nothing else can explain their success. Now is there a single person in this assembly who can bring himself to think that such a belief, such an absolute and over-ruling conviction can really have been produced, and that not on one or two, but upon some dozens of persons by a sigh of the wind through the lattice, or the crazy tale of an hysteric prostitute? Or, to take Strauss' solution: does anyone think that this intense, energetic conviction can have been due to reasoning such as he suggests, viz., that they first persuaded themselves, out of the Old Testament, that the Messiah *was* to die and rise again, next that their Master *was* the Messiah, and therefore, by way of conclusion, that their Master *had* arisen? Has the triumph of Christianity really no deeper basis than a syllogism like this? Or, to take an explanation lately given by a benevolent English lady, who thinks thereby to get rid of that disfigurement to Christianity, "the monster-miracle of the Resurrection;" does anyone think that because the followers of Jesus were "convinced," as she says they were, "that so good a man could not be dead, that His spirit must be in Paradise among the sons of God;" this new-born faith would at once "clothe itself in a materialistic form, and by the time the Gospels were written had become stereotyped in traditions which we can only describe as Jewish ghost stories?" This last attempt is even more absurd than those of Strauss and Renan, because it inverts the order of the facts, supposing the Resurrection of Christ to be an after-growth of Christianity, instead of being its basis, as we know it was.

Passing on from the belief of the Apostles in their Master's Resurrection, and from the equally inexplicable fact that in a few years they had succeeded in persuading thousands of Jews, in Jerusalem as well as elsewhere, to share this belief, there being nothing to gain and everything to lose by it, let us glance at the progress of Christianity, as manipulated by M. Renan. According to him, the history of Christianity has run counter to the history of all other known religions. In every other case elements of discord expand into ever-increasing consequence; differences of theory or action, originally slight, become more and more pronounced, diverge more and more widely, as time advances. Look, *e.g.*, at the two main sects which divide Turkish and Persian Mohammedanism, the Sonnees and the Shiahs. Originally slight, the difference between them being merely as to whether Ali or Omar should be recognised as the second Khalif in succession to the Prophet, this difference has now become insurmountable: not merely the succession to the Khalifate, but the whole doctrine of the religion has become involved; and two systems, the one of Theism, the other of Pantheism, divide Islam into two bitterly hostile camps.

According to M. Renan, the difference between Paul and the other Apostles was infinitely wider; wider than "all the differences which sunder all the heretics and schismatics in Christendom;" two alien and hostile schools of thought and practice divided Christianity; the school of Paul and the school of Peter, James, and John; two alien and hostile Churches represented these schools, at Rome actually side by side. Yet, marvellous to relate, within forty years of the death of the two great Apostles, all trace of difference and hostility has vanished, and one united Church has forgotten that it was the outcome of two different Churches sundered by a complete dissonance of thought and feeling.

But this is not all. There are two ways in which such differences might be extinguished. The two rival systems may coalesce into a third different from either, or the one system may destroy the other and take its place. Now the latter method is obviously much the easier. We might, perhaps, conceive that the Christianity of the Roman Church, and of the rest of Christendom, was a "survival of the fittest," in the shape of Pauline Christianity, (which M. Renan considers nearly equivalent to Protestantism) the religion of free thought and progress; the Christianity of Peter and his school having been gradually pressed out of existence by the superior vitality and vigour of its rival. But this is not M. Renan's idea, so far as I understand him. He takes the union of the two Apostles in the tradition of the Roman Church, (the Papacy always ascribing its authority to both) as representing a *fusion* of their two systems into a third, differing from either. Now such a phenomenon would be unique, not only in the history of other religions, but in that of Christianity itself. Within the Church diverging opinions have always tended to diverge more widely, when one or other has not been quite suppressed. Arianism, *e.g.*, has either become extinct, or gone over into Socinianism. It has not modified orthodoxy in the

least. The addition of two words to the Nicene Creed has ended in the disruption of Eastern and Western Christendom. The adoption by the third General Council of a single epithet led to the development of a couple of heresies not yet extinct. The denial of Papal Supremacy split the Western Church in two at the Reformation. It is only in the early Church, and then only during those dark forty years concerning which we have hardly a syllable of authentic information, that a deadly feud between two hostile Churches, each tracing its doctrine to antagonist apostles, was marvellously settled; and that not by absorption or by conquest, but by coalescence between these two radically different bodies; coalescence so absolute that it has eluded the keenest scrutiny for almost two thousand years! And to this coalescence, which took place first at Rome and then throughout all Christendom under the influence of Rome, M. Renan traces the primacy of the See of Rome! Here the pupil of the Seminary peeps out of the cloak of the philosopher; with all his learning, M. Renan has not learnt the very simple fact that the primacy of the Roman See is best accounted for by that to which two General Councils ascribe it, viz., its commanding *secular* position in the capital of the Roman world.

But M. Renan's theory of the "Origins" of Christianity is even more inconceivable when applied to the Eastern Churches. We have seen his view as to the width of the gulf that separated Paul from the Apostles of the circumcision. Of these James and John were even more hostile to Paul than Peter was. The latter, indeed, appears in M. Renan's pages in a very vague and fluctuating aspect; sometimes as following Paul like his shadow in order to counteract his teaching; sometimes as almost if not altogether reconciled to him; and according as the one or the other of these views predominates the first Epistle of Peter is considered a forgery or accepted as a genuine picture of his teaching. But about James and John M. Renan has no doubt; the former flatly contradicts Paul's notions on justification, the latter even forges letters as from the Holy Ghost to the seven Asiatic Churches, in order to ruin Paul's character and destroy his influence. An indication of the fruits of this opposition is detected in the notice in the Second Epistle to Timothy, that all they of Asia deserted Paul during his imprisonment at Rome, no doubt influenced by John's animosity. What, then, are we to think of the fact that of all this hostility on the part of John against Paul, not a trace can be found either in the history or the tradition of a single Asiatic Church or bishop! That these Churches, whilst reverencing John as their latest apostolic ruler, when Paul had been removed by death, cling to Paul with equal veneration, and never betray the slightest notion that any hostility or difference ever existed between these two Apostles!

Nor can this state of things be traced up to any such early influence of the See or Church of Rome, as M. Renan fancies. *For the Asiatic Churches absolutely ignored the authority of Rome.* They declared that they had learned from St. John to celebrate Easter on the fourteenth day of the Paschal moon, whatever day of the week that fourteenth day might be; and they set at naught alike the entreaties and the menaces of the Roman See for the first two centuries. And when they did give way, it was the learning of the See of Alexandria and not the blundering chronography of Rome that decided the Fathers of Nicæa. And yet we are now asked to believe that in a matter infinitely more important, a matter not of mere ritual, but involving the whole nature of Christianity, these Churches first followed their founder Paul, then apostatized from him to John, and were finally induced to harmonise the antagonist teachings of these apostles; and did it so completely as entirely to forget that there had been any difference at all between them! This is not history but romance.

To revert for a moment to another difficulty: the difficulty of accounting for St. Paul's conversion.—I have often vainly attempted to conceive a mind such as Paul's becomes in M. Renan's hands. A mind incapable of distinguishing between facts and fancies; mistaking the hallucinations of delirium for real external facts: a mind changed in a moment by this mistake, not merely in its convictions (as I pointed out before) but in character also, which is a very different thing: a mind the prey of the most pitiful delusions, and yet a mind of such breadth and power as to overleap at a bound the barriers of national and religious partiality, and literally to create the universal Church in the face of the opposition of all the rest of the Apostles! Such minds may exist in the conceptions of modern novelists, but they have not hitherto existed in the creations of the great masters of thought and imagination any more than in the realities of history.

And this difficulty, again, is cumulated by the fact that Paul adduces historic, and not merely personal, reasons for proclaiming Christ as risen. Had he required his converts to believe solely on his *own* personal evidence, had he dwelt exclusively on the appearances of the risen Saviour to *himself*, the notion that Paul was a fanatic might not be so utterly absurd. But he adduces other testimonies: he dwells on them much more than on his own experience: and every additional witness augments the force of the combined evidence enormously. Whilst the number of witnesses to any given fact increases in arithmetical, the strength of their united evidence increases in geometrical, proportion. In Paul's own representation a vast change is wrought by an adequate cause, and produces its natural effect. In M. Renan's representation a vast change is wrought by a cause entirely inadequate, and the effect is out of all proportion. The miraculous is thus not got rid of in the least: it is only shifted from its proper place, and appears in the character of Paul instead of in the historic facts which acted on that character.

What, then, is the foundation on which M. Renan, following in the steps of an already antiquated German School, has constructed an account of the "Origins" of Christianity so entirely different from that which the New Testament and the earliest authentic documents afford?

It consists almost entirely of two curious religious novels, entitled the Homilies and Recognitions of St. Clement, and written in the latter half of the 2nd Century, by some unknown author, for the purpose of recommending a strange eclectic mixture of unorthodox Judaism and equally unorthodox Christianity as the religion founded by Christ and preached by the greatest of his Apostles.

According to this writer, the Law of Moses is of eternal validity. This law is found in the Old Testament. But it is not found there absolutely pure. Some parts of that book are due to an Evil Principle, and only some to God: and the author accordingly represents our Saviour as several times enjoining on his disciples the necessity of being "good money-changers," able to distinguish false coin from true, the false teaching of some parts of the Old Testament from the true teaching of the rest. But as the Old Testament, with this reserve, is still to be the rule of life, and the religion of Christ is really nothing but Judaism, the authority of St. Paul, which is altogether opposed to such a system, must be depreciated and destroyed: and accordingly he is dressed up in the name and attributes of Simon Magus, and is confuted and exposed by St. Peter, in several discussions that take place between them in the writer's presence.

Of the untrustworthiness of this forgery as an historical authority, or rather of its author's utter ignorance of the history of the very Church for whose opinions M. Renan chiefly uses it, you may take this as a sample. The author makes Clement succeed Peter immediately in the bishoprick of Rome, being consecrated by Peter himself to that high office. Now, Clement did not become bishop till nearly 40 years after Peter's death! When therefore M. Renan adduces this book in proof of that Judaizing and anti-Pauline tendency in the Church of Rome which his theory requires, he does much the same thing as would be done by a person who should rely for a true idea of the state of things in England during the last Century, on an author so ignorant of English history as to make Charles Fox the immediate successor of Lord Chatham as Prime Minister.

That the book does not represent the sentiments of any considerable party in the Church is evident from the fact that its author does not venture to attack St. Paul by name. Had the authority of the great Apostle been widely questioned, there would have been no occasion to veil his personality under the name of the detested magician of Samaria.

Yet on this frail foundation, the foundation of an anonymous romance, bearing a lie on its very title, and convicted of the most astounding ignorance of the history of the very Church whose tendencies M. Renan takes it to represent, and which insinuates doubts as to the authority of the Old Testament, such as to Jewish Christians would seem nothing short of blasphemy; on the testimony of a book like this, does M. Renan build a theory of early Christianity at Rome, such as never entered the mind of man till within the last half century, and this theory he presents to a London audience, not as a theory, but as an unquestionable fact!

It is fortunate that we possess a document which is absolutely beyond all suspicion. The Book of Acts is now supposed to have been written with a purpose, in order to create that union between the two parties in the Church which it represents as actually existing. I believe that such a purpose only exists in the brains of modern theorists. But at any rate no such purpose can be attributed to the Epistle of St. James. This Epistle, whether written by James or not, is beyond all doubt a product of the time in which Christianity had not yet broken with Judaism. It is addressed not to Christians as such, but to the Twelve Tribes in the dispersion. It makes no distinction between Jews and Christians. The persons to whom it is addressed meet for worship in the Synagogue, for that is the word translated "Assembly" in the 2nd Chapter. Exactly the same state appears in the narrative of St. Paul's last visit to Jerusalem. He is received at the house of James, by James and all the elders of the Church. They tell him that there are tens of thousands of Christian Jews in Jerusalem, all zealous for the law. For the purpose of conciliating the good-will of these, by shewing them that he has not taught Jews anywhere to break the Law, as they had been sedulously told, they advise him to pay the expenses of certain brethren in discharging the Nazarite vow, and to attend with them at the solemn Temple service therewith connected. Can anything be clearer than that the Gospel, so far as Jewish Christians were concerned, had not yet discarded the trammels of the Law?

What, then, is the attitude of the writer of this thoroughly Jewish letter—a letter addressed to Jews as such, whether they be Christians or not? Is it one of proud Jewish self-assertion? of contempt of heathendom? of rancorous hostility to the man who dared to preach the Gospel to those outside the sacred covenant of circumcision?

Not a trace of any such feeling appears throughout it: but on the contrary, in the very first chapter there is an expression of directly opposite tendency. "Of his own will did God beget us, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures." Now, if the first-fruits were holy, the lump from which they were taken was holy, according to Jewish notions. If therefore those whom James addressed were the first-fruits of mankind, mankind at large share the holiness of these first-fruits. Is this the language of exclusive Judaism? the stand-aside doctrine, for I am holier than thou, which M. Renan attributes to the Apostles of the Circumcision, and, above all, to James?

The second chapter, however, betrays its writer's hostility to Paul in its opposition to his teaching regarding faith and works. Does it, indeed? What is the faith which James pronounces useless? Is it that faith of which Paul speaks? Entire trust in God, leading to entire obedience to God? Not at all. It is simply dogmatic orthodoxy; belief in Monotheism. "*Thou*" (emphatic in the Greek) "thou," as opposed to the blind Polytheists amongst whom thou dwellest, "thou believest that God is one. Thou doest well: the demons also believe and shudder." He is not here speaking of the "faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory," as He was in the beginning of the chapter, when warning them against making distinctions between rank and wealth on the one hand, and poverty on the other, in their synagogue. He is speaking of that belief in the Divine unity, which was the chief distinction of the Jew as it is the chief distinction of the Mohammedan to this day. And he tells them that the most perfect orthodoxy on this point, vital though it be, will not suffice unless it lead to action. And thus this famous passage only carries out the much-neglected declaration in the previous chapter that "Every good gift and every perfect benefaction is from above, and cometh from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." As the second chapter warns against mistaking orthodox belief for saving faith, so does this part of the first chapter condemn the blasphemous idea that virtue in a heathen is not virtue but only splendid vice. Unquestionably the Epistle views Christianity from a different stand-point to that of Paul, as it is addressed to an entirely different set of persons from any to whom Paul wrote; but the two sets of writings, so far from contradicting, only supplement each other.

And yet St. James was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, if the account given by Hegesippus in the fragment preserved by Eusebius be correct. A man who spent whole days in the Temple praying for his people on his knees till they became as hard as the knees of a camel; clad only in linen, eating nothing that has life, never using the common luxury of the Roman bath; having the extraordinary privilege of going into the holy place like the priests, not to speak of the fabulous addition of Epiphanius, which M. Renan in his usual way mixes up with the three centuries earlier Hegesippus, as if they were of exactly the same value, viz., that James wore the petalon or thin gold plate inscribed "Holiness to the Lord," which was the official badge of the high priest alone. If this man, so distinguished by austerity and sanctity as to command the veneration even of the enemies of Christ, if this man, when writing to Jews throughout the world, whether Christians or not, could write in so large a spirit and give such solemn warning against that very tendency to national pride, and orthodox exclusiveness, which was the chief obstruction to Paul's activity, are we to take M. Renan's assurance that James hated and counteracted Paul; that Paul was to him a heresiarch because he preached Christ to the whole of that race, whose consecration was involved in the consecration of its first fruits? Not only is M. Renan's theory baseless; not only is it so improbable as to be almost impossible; it is in the teeth of every authentic document; its only faint support is a fantastic novel, which betrays the ignorance of its author as well as his unscrupulousness on its very face.

No doubt St. Paul experienced the bitterest opposition from those who called themselves followers of Kephas and came, or pretended to come, from James. But Peter and James were not more secure against being misinterpreted and misrepresented by their admirers than was Paul; it is in their own writings that we must seek for men's real thoughts; and in the writings of Peter and of James there is not a word to discredit Paul's solemn declaration to the Galatians, that he had the full approbation both of James and Peter in what he did.

What is the secret, you make perhaps ask, of these efforts to represent early Christianity as a weltering chaos of opposite opinions, gradually cemented into unity by the ordering, over-ruling spirit of Rome? Partly a wish to reduce Christianity to a mere natural product; partly, no doubt, a reminiscence, a survival, of the bias of the Seminarist. Even the brief horrors of the Neronian persecution, which could have lasted only a few weeks, at most, are pressed into the service of the supposed early ascendancy of Rome, and are invested with an importance and influence far beyond what sober history can accept.

What M. Renan's theories really lead to, may be best stated in the pathetic words of his last lecture. "After all, we know nothing; life is a journey between two long nights. All that we can deem certain is that at intervals a parental smile traverses nature, and reveals to us that an eye looks down upon us and a heart follows us. Let us rest in that faith, without troubling ourselves with formulas that can scarcely be verified." You are all aware that this faith, which the amiable Frenchman regards as being so certain, is absolutely rejected by the modern Atheistic or Agnostic school. To that school the faith which to M. Renan is so precious, appears quite as childish as M. Renan himself thinks that larger and more cheering faith to be in which we Christians have been educated, and which it is my task on this occasion to shew you that we are not called on to abandon. Once started on the broad downward road of scepticism--scepticism which manufactures history to suit the thesis that the miraculous is impossible—there is no reason whatever why we should stop where M. Renan wishes us to stop. We must go down the incline until we reach the bottom, where no paternal "eye" is felt to watch us, no paternal

"heart" to follow us: where the despairing words of the Greek chorus are the only fitting expression of our fate; and we feel that not of one great malefactor only, but of all mankind, it may be truly said that "it would have been good for us not to have been born."

ST. PAUL'S CHARACTER.

By the Rev. H. E. WETHERALL, B.A., Curate of St. John's, Great Marlborough Street.

Sermon Preached at St. John's, on July 4, 1880.

"The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand."—1 Cor. xvi. 21.

"Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand."—Gal. vi. 11.

FOR some time past, when I have preached in this church, I have endeavoured to explain the circumstances which produced the letter known as the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and above all the personal character of the man who wrote under the stress of these circumstances, in order that the meaning of his words might be somewhat clearer and fuller than it would be if the Epistle was simply read without the light of any such illustrations. Moreover, by way of introducing a practical element into the matter, I have tried, whenever it was possible, to point out by a comparison of the Corinthian past with the English present, the aspect under which our Nineteenth Century life would have appeared to St. Paul, and to set forth the judgment which he would in all likelihood pass upon many of the prejudices, and social conventionalities, and moral peculiarities, and forms of religious thought, which we hold so dear. It has been a great pleasure to me, step by step to bring the various scenes within the ken of my imagination, and to realise the grand nature of the man who moved in their midst; to find how, in order to further his one great purpose of diffusing a true Christian spirit around him, no self-effacement was too complete for him, no peril of loss of reputation and friendship too great for him; to see how his vigorous moral feelings tolerated no unrealities of conduct nor any casuistical excuses; and how his keen common-sense pierced at once to the bottom of theological difficulties; proof against all the confusions which spring from the infirmity of language, and all the subtle fallacies of those Greek institutions which had at that time become schools of sophistry rather than of philosophy. All the more interesting and important topics of the Epistle have been dealt with already. Nevertheless I do not hesitate to take this morning a subject from the mere common-places of civility with which the letter closes, because, such is my admiration for the writer, that I feel that I shall be likely even from this source to draw as useful, if not more useful reflections, than would cluster round any other subject I might choose. "The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand." Simple enough these words seem, and yet if you read between the lines there is something about them singularly pathetic. They imply sufferings both of body and mind of the keenest quality. Could we stand for a moment in that small bare room in the wretched house of a mean street in Ephesus, where this letter was in all likelihood written, we should be witnesses of a sight deserving of our warmest sympathies. We should see a man, tortured by disease into an object that was miserable to look upon, groping his way with dim uncertain sight to the place where the one who wrote for him sat, and with his hand guided to the parchment, setting down in large characters a few words of greeting. Could we read what was passing in his mind, as he painfully made these marks, we should know that he had been the object of calumny and misrepresentation, of feelings of hate which stopped short at no deeds of baseness, and which, not content with words of abuse, had even forged his writings in order to bring him into disrepute; and that he was feeling that he was writing in self-defence, in order to set the seal of authenticity upon his letter! Who would not say that this was a singularly unfortunate man—wretched far beyond the ordinary lot of humanity? And so he would be, were there no world save this of sense: of pleasures of the eye, and ear, and taste; of money-making; of what with unconscious, but none the less incisive irony, is called society, to be considered in our calculations. Viewing such a sight, the lover of art would think with a shudder of the delight of form, and light, and colour, which could be his no more, were he in such a plight; and feel that then life would be intolerable. The man of business would think of the speculations, and subtle combinations which so maimed he could no longer enter upon, and the conviction would come home to him that were he like St. Paul, all the joy would be taken from his days: the thought of the hours of inaction and powerlessness through which he would have to drag himself, would rise before him as a very doleful picture. Worse still would be the reflection of the sensitive person of fashion, to whom the very name and shadow of sickness and suffering is a thing of horror; a perfect swarm of painful fancies would rise before him, phantoms of throngs of fair faces, and bright and gleaming forms, amongst which he would know that, if he resembled St. Paul, he would be as unwelcome as a skeleton at a banquet of friends, who would gradually drop off from him; and of rivals whom he had slighted, who would regard his social disqualifications with scarcely concealed satisfaction. And yet this universal verdict would be quite wrong. Fortunately for the many sick and suffering and injured souls, this world of sense is not all in all, alone measuring out to us our lot of happiness or misery. There is another world, the kingdom of God, into which St. Paul had entered to the joys of which his personal deformity was no bar—a world within his heart and mind—whose peace no earthly suffering, no attacks of wicked men

were powerful enough to disturb. This will become plain if we reflect for a short time upon the aims and purposes which shaped his life, and the success and activity which, by pursuing these, had become possible to him, despite his physical infirmities, and the mean circumstances by which he was surrounded. For, only consider the memories of which his spiritual being was built up—memories extending back now for years of a constant chain of acts of pure unselfishness, all done with the one aim of doing good to his suffering fellow-creatures, in the feeling that he himself was nothing, but merely one out of the myriad agencies through which God's laws are working towards perfection; memories of conquests won by love over the hearts of the proud, the sensual, the frivolous, until it had come to pass that he—this weak, blind, unattractive man—had become the centre to which many a community looked with the deepest affection and surest confidence for guidance in their difficulties; and when he looked back upon his career, and thought of the affectionate feelings with which he knew he would be greeted if he turned his steps to Antioch, to Galatia, to Troas, to Philippi, to Thessalonica, to Athens, and many a place beside, and realized that where there might be some who looked upon him with suspicion and hatred, it arose from no wrong doing of his, but from the very earnestness of his efforts to do them benefits, despite their wicked selves, who can doubt, but that here he possessed recources of imperishable happiness, which would enable him to triumph over all the weariness of pain and stings of adverse fortune, and render him joyful, rather than unhappy when death, as was so often the case, seemed very near to him. Of course one can but slightly indicate, and represent merely in faint shadow, the working of the mind and feelings of such a man as St. Paul, after he had, to use the language of Scripture, entered into this Kingdom of God, and become one with Christ, dead unto self and sin, and alive unto God through Jesus Christ, and thus in a sense ascended with Christ from earth to heaven. What visions of divine glory he, in common with such great souls as Isaiah, and Ezekiel, and John, and our own Milton, may have had, giving to his life a light unknown to us; what vistas of the possible workings of God's laws, and the possible extension of human good, our duller imaginations are powerless to grasp; but however imperfectly we are able to appreciate such a man's condition, no one can look at the matter with any depth of feeling and insight without confessing that a life devoted to selfish aims, and gratifications of sense has no happiness to offer, which for permanence and purity can in any way equal, that which St. Paul had found in Christ. Suffering and the prospect of another life awaits us all with more or less certainty; no realities of life are greater than these. It is surely well to remember this, whenever we take thought about the purposes at which to direct our courses of action. Recollections of exquisite moments of æsthetic delight, or of coarser indulgence of sense, of strokes of business, advantageously carried out with as much craft and as near an approach to dishonesty as the customs of a trade or profession and the law will allow; of enemies whom we have crushed, and aversions which we have gratified by the superiority of our intellects or position; of social successes which we have won by arts of which, though we have practised them, we have been secretly ashamed, and which in others we have loudly condemned; these will be but unwelcome companions in the weary wakefulness of sickness, associates with whom we shall go shuddering to the grave. When I reflect how heedlessly and unwittingly we allow ourselves to be hurried along by the stream of the everyday world, permitting ourselves to act by convention, by the low standard of those whom chance throws in our way, careless of anything higher than to stand well in their eyes, though we are fully aware of the imperfections of their lives, I can think of no more wholesome remedy than to, as it were, stand in front and scrutinise such a character as that of St. Paul, as a means of learning the truth, which we cannot grasp too soon, or realise too vividly, that earth has nothing to offer in the way of happiness at all equal to the happiness to be won through Christ.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. VIII. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 17, 1880.

WE desire to direct the attention of our readers to Archdeacon Reichel's very able sermon, which we print on another page. In it will, we think, be found a complete and conclusive refutation of M. Renan's fallacies which, owing to the consummate artistic and rhetorical powers of their author, were made peculiarly attractive to the Æsthetic proclivities of the present day, and consequently in danger of being accepted as true and working great mischief in Society. We are extremely pleased, therefore, that Dr. Reichel has subjected them to the unbiassed scrutiny of his well-furnished and most logical mind, and allowed us to publish the results, which are sure to command, as they deserve, the attention of our readers.

CLERICAL RESTRICTIONS AT THE UNIVERSITIES.

WE look with considerable apprehension upon the movement to abolish the Clerical Fellowships and Headships of Colleges in the highest and most ancient Seminaries of Learning. It would be a mistake to exclude the practical teaching of moral and religious truth from such institutions, and such truth is best taught by the example of holy and experienced men who are engaged at the same time in imparting secular knowledge and thereby in constant contact with their pupils. Young men just encountering the temptations of life are in special need of imbibing such wisdom by example as well as by precept: and who so fitted to give it as the College Tutor, standing as he does *in loco parentis?* The moral and religious influence of such men as ARNOLD and WHEWELL during the last, and of LIDDON and LIGHTFOOT during the present generation has been enormous. Inasmuch as the health and strength of a nation entirely depend on its morality, even from a worldly point of view it is of immense importance to retain such tutors for our youth. Again, we fear that the disestablishment of such tutors and religious guides would eventually lead to the diminishment, if not the abolition of the *tutorial* system of teaching and, may be, of the Colleges themselves in our Universities. There is at the present time an evil tendency, as we think, to supersede the *tutorial* by the professorial system of teaching. Each system has its advantages and its special applicability to different branches of learning. But we should certainly regret to see the *tutorial*, which is the distinctive feature in our University teaching, impaired by the action of the Commissioners in dealing with the constitution of the Colleges. There can surely be no intention or wish to cripple or discourage the teaching of Theology and Ecclesiastical History.

CORRESPONDENCE.

GOOD FOOLS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I cannot but fear, from the tone of "A Frequent Reader's" letter, that he finds himself specially referred to in my article on "Good Fools;" indeed, had I not hit too near the mark, so angry a correspondent would hardly have made the flattering admission that the quality of my "mind must furnish an unimpeachable qualification for my self-imposed task," viz., the description of "Good Fools."

I am sorry that your correspondent has so poor an opinion of the "command of language" possessed by your humble servant, but it may be some gratification to "A Frequent Reader" to learn that I cannot say anything so disparaging of him, for I notice in his letter a "command of language" which is quite startling; his description of my article as "singularly foolish and *indecent*" is particularly forcible, and the more so as there is not the faintest approach to anything "indecent" in it. His "command of language"—especially strong language—is also shown in such eloquent outbursts as, "intensity of impertinent self-conceit," "near approach to insanity," and "offensive nonsense." But I would venture humbly to suggest that before giving way to such an outburst of wrath, your correspondent should have remembered that I am in that favoured condition of "*greater fredom and less responsibility*" in which indulgence in any amount of abuse, even though it has little or no foundation in truth, is permissible; at least, so I am taught by a statesman who "stands second to none."

To argue with such a master of words as your correspondent, especially as he does not condescend to use either fact or argument, would be the extreme of rashness; I will therefore conclude by hoping that the PULPIT will long survive the prophetic denunciation of "A Frequent Reader," and will not, to quote his unintelligible jargon, "fall unwept and unforgotten into the limbo of weeds and worn-out faces;" but that it may long continue to circulate through the length and breadth of the land the pulpit utterances of the great leaders of thought in the English Church. M. A. M.

P.S.—I need hardly say that I used the word "fool" *not in its offensive sense*, but merely as indicative more or less of folly.

Reviews and Notices.

"SOME QUESTIONS OF THE DAY. A Charge to the Clergy, Churchwardens, and Sidesmen, of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex." By the Ven. James Augustus Hessey, D.C.L., Archdeacon of Middlesex. London: Thomas Scott, Warwick Court, Holborn. 1880. Pp. 50.

This charge, delivered in the Parish Church of St. Paul, Covent Garden, deals with many topics of deep interest to earnest Churchmen. After some well-expressed prefatory observations upon the true relations of the members of the Episcopal Bench to the Clergy of their respective dioceses, and passing allusions to two eminent benefactors of the Church, recently called to "rest from their labours"—John Torr, who died as he was completing the endowment of a Bishopric for Liverpool, to which he himself contributed ten thousand pounds, and Phillip Cazenove, dear to many, both on public and private grounds—Dr. Hessey proceeds to allude to subjects, which although "in the border land of the temporal and the spiritual," concern the Clergy to a considerable extent, as to the exercise of their solemn functions. The Archdeacon earnestly deprecates legislative permission that marriages with the deceased wife's sister should take place. He holds that such an alliance is forbidden by "the Table of Affinity, wherein whoever are related are forbidden by Scripture and our laws to marry together." The parliamentary discussions upon the grave subject have, he contends, already "done harm and shaken the sanctity of the relation between a man and his wife and his wife's sister." With reference to the maintenance of the fabrics of Churches, and to making adequate provision for meeting the necessary expenses connected with the ministrations therein, the writer of the Charge expresses regret (a feeling shared by all loyal members of the Church), that numerous parishes exist in which Churches are becoming dilapidated for lack of funds, and that the number of ecclesiastical buildings thus needing repair is annually upon the increase. He then refers to

the Report of the Royal Commissioners to the effect, that funds are attached to parishes in the City which are not absolutely required in those districts, and which might well be applied to the erection or repair of Churches, and to supplying the spiritual needs of poorer parishes located in the metropolitan area. "Parliament should, he thinks, be petitioned to that effect." Precedents exist for the course so advisable to be taken, namely, the redistribution of Cathedral and Episcopal property, the taking down of City Churches, and the appropriation of the sums realised by the disposal of their sites, to the erection and the endowment of Churches in districts in which those formerly resident in the City are now living. Although it be true that arrangements have been made to give, from time to time, various sums from the "Bishop of London's Fund," in aid of Churches in urgent need of pecuniary help, the pressure of new work has been so great, that the supplies are by no means adequate to meet the demands. Archdeacon Hessey repels the imputation that the clergy are not sufficently diligent in seeking out children to be brought to the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, and quotes an important return signed by Archdeacon Jennings, in his capacity as Rural-Dean, setting forth the number of births returned by the civil Registrar, and that of Baptisms registered during the last four years, in the parish of St. John the Evangelist, Westminster, now divided into the parishes of St. John, St. Mary, St. Stephen, St. Matthew, Holy Trinity, and St. James the Less." The next observations in the Charge relate to the embarrassed position of the clergy of duly constituted district Parishes with regard to the solemnization of marriages, and to the legal technicalities more or less affecting the Clergy, which beset the subject of marriages generally. Then follow expressions of the Archdeacon's views upon the subject of the letting or appropriation, or the absolute freedom of seats in Churches, questions which have become so much complicated by the shifting of population, and also upon the questions of Reform in Convocation. Adverting to the subject of the duty of the wealthy members of the Established Church in London, towards their brethren in the east of the Metropolis, the writer says, "How wretched should we be, were our Churches empty, if we found it impossible to get assistance in our services, and in our parochial works. How much should we miss that band of lay-helpers who collect and contribute to our offertories, and those faithful women who visit our poor districts, and gather our young female communicants and guard them kindly. Contrast with this," he continues, "the lot of a clergyman, perhaps with no curate to help him, in care of five or ten thousand, not only not rich, but consisting of families not one of which is able to keep a servant, and with a Church squalid and destitute of worshippers, devoid of warmth and life, materially and spiritually. I know not how if we shut our eyes and our ears to all this we can avoid a humiliating self-application of the text. 'Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?'" As regards the observance of Sunday, the writer very clearly expresses his views. While objecting to unnecessary interference with the employment of persons on the Lord's Day, and avowing his belief that the day was intended for the rest of the body as well as for the improvement of the soul, he strongly disapproves of what he terms, "an unnatural alliance between the secularizers of the Lord's Day, who would allow all sorts of public lectures to be given, and all sorts of exhibitions to be opened upon it as being no better than other days, and certain of the zealous clergy who would wish exhibitions to be open." Upon the following grounds he counsels the clergy to pause, and to weigh well the consequences, before they join that secularizing movement: 1st, Intellectual tastes cannot be implanted at once, and their objects would not engage the classes intended. Next, the opening of exhibitions would lead to the opening of other places, such as theatres, which would utterly secularize the Holy Day; and lastly, the attraction of such an opening would be a snare to many who, at present, devote the Lord's Day, more or less, to religious purposes, and who are contented with the parks and wholesome out-door recreation.

It is gratifying to find that, at the close of this admirable Charge, the Archdeacon takes an encouraging view of the future of the English Church. "I have not the slightest fear," he says, "(so long as she continues true to herself) for the interests of the Church *even as an establishment*." . . . "The Church is day by day becoming stronger in her temporal position, because she is, day by day, increasingly earnest in her work." "*Laborare est orare*, is her motto, and she puts forth the first of these, to her, inseparable energies in the divine strength obtained by the second." Copies of forms for engaging in correspondence upon the subject of the London Diocesan Conference, one also for corresponding with reference to a Conference in the diocese, with other important subjects, occupying eight pages of a closely printed appendix. The document, appropriately termed "Some Questions of the Day," evidences, throughout, that it is the work of a vigilant "Oculus Episcopi," discharging the duties of his office in no hurried or perfunctory manner, but with a full sense of the responsibilities which attach to it.

———: o :———

At the Leicester Church Congress the Bishops of Winchester, Meath, Gibraltar, and the Valley of Mexico, Dr. Nevin, American Chaplain at Rome, and Prebendary Meyrick will read papers or speak on "Efforts towards Reform in Foreign Churches, and the attitude of the Church of England towards them." The Bishop of Carlisle, the Dean of Lichfield, Archdeacon Emery, Canon Garbett, Professor Montagu Burrows, and Mr. Stanley Leighton, M.P., have undertaken to deal with the question "Whether it is desirable that increased facilities or powers of legislation should be granted to Convocation; and if so, whether the granting of such powers or facilities should be accompanied by any, and what reforms of Convocation."

On Friday the son and heir of Mr. John Henry Gurney, jun., was baptised at the church of St. Mary, Northrepps, under the name of Gerard Hudson Gurney, by the Rev. Dr. Creswell. The font was decorated with flowers, and a full and well-trained choir sang the hymn "O Father, Thou Who hast created all," besides sustaining the responses. The Gurney family, the Dowager Lady Buxton and party, and a large congregation of parishioners, witnessed the ceremony. The farmers and their wives were then entertained at Northrepps Hall by Mr. J. H. Gurney, the grandfather of the child, and in the evening the fine peal of bells rang out their rejoicings from the church-steeple. The cottagers' entertainment is to follow.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has conferred the degree of Doctor in Divinity on the Rev. Chas. Egbert Kennett, Principal of the Theological College at Madras, on account of his missionary services in India, especially among the Tamil-speaking population.

In addressing his parishioners at Stradbrooke, Bishop Ryle said:—"My life has been a very curious one. I was not brought up for the Church. The last thing I should have expected up to the time I was twenty-five years of age was that I ever should be a clergyman. My father was a wealthy man. He was a landed proprietor and a banker; I was the eldest son, and looked forward to inheriting a large fortune. I was on the point of entering Parliament. I had all these things before me till I was twenty-five; but it then pleased God to alter my prospects in life through my father's bankruptcy. The change was a very crushing one for the time. It did crush me terribly, and for many years I could hardly lift up my head." The Bishop then described his clerical life in the New Forest, at Helmingham, and Stradbroke, and said that he never expected to leave the latter parish. "I never thought that a man who had taken such a decided stand as I have done as a Protestant clergyman, as an Evangelical clergyman, would ever be called upon by the Prime Minister to take a different position. I always thought the quiet men, those who won't kick up a row, those who could be trusted to go quietly and gently, were chosen, and it never struck me that I should be called upon to take a higher position than the Vicar of Stradbroke. But, as you are aware, in April I was offered by Lord Beaconsfield the deanery of Salisbury. I did not like it at all. I went to Salisbury, and the more I looked at it the less I liked it. I wrote to my friends and asked them what I should do, and they all said I ought not to refuse it. They said it was my plain duty to go, and so under pressure I accepted it. My friends at Stradbroke did me the favour to say that I looked a miserable man. I felt like a dog with his tail between his legs. But although I did not feel comfortable, I felt that it was my duty to go. But I was suddenly relieved. On a Wednesday evening I received a telegram from Lord Beaconsfield's secretary asking me to go to London for an interview on the next day on a very important matter. Of course, I could not exactly make out what it meant, but I felt it my duty to go, and at twelve o'clock I saw Lord Sandon, the member for Liverpool, who told me they had sent for me for the simple purpose of asking me whether I would accept the bishopric of Liverpool. I said, 'I am not so young as some people. I am not a wealthy man to take a new bishopric.' He replied, 'We know all that; we have made up our minds about that; the question is, Will you take the bishopric of Liverpool or not?' I said, 'My lord, I will go.' Salisbury took a week to think about, but to be Bishop of Liverpool did not take five minutes. I thought it was a clear, plain call of duty. I would much rather wear out as Bishop of Liverpool than rust out as Dean of Salisbury. Well, I asked Lord Sandon several questions, which he answered, and, this ended, I was taken in to Lord Beaconsfield, who gave me an interview, kind and courteous as one would expect from that wonderful statesman. He gave me excellent advice, which I hope I shall never forget. I told him I was not so young as I used to be; I did not get younger. He took a good look at me from head to foot, and said, 'I think, Sir, you have a good constitution.' I hope his words may prove true, and that my constitution may prove equal to the work when I get to Liverpool."

A painted window, in memory of the late Sir Francis Hopkins, has just been erected by his sister, Mrs. Tottenham, in the church of Moyliscar, Mullingar. The work is from the studio of Mr. W. G. Taylor, of Berners-street.

Complaints having again been made to the Bishop of Winchester regarding the manner in which the services are conducted in St. Peter's, Bournemouth, his lordship has written to the vicar, Prebendary Harland, suggesting that altar-lights be dispensed with at Communion, and the *Agnus Dei* discontinued, that the consecrating priest should kneel when receiving the Sacrament, that black stoles only should be worn, and that no water should be mixed with the wine. The vicar has announced his intention of complying with the Bishop's request, although he regrets the necessity of making changes in the services.

Preaching at the Bolton parish church, on Sunday, the Bishop of Manchester said some of the clergy feared that if the Burials Bill passed we should have scenes of desecration and disorder, and the most blasphemous, atheistical doctrine proclaimed aloud. He did not believe a bit of it. He for one would be only too glad if the bill, which had caused too much grievance and unsettlement, soon became the law of the land. He had no fear that the privilege would be abused in the way some people, who would not trust their neighbours as he wished they could trust them, feared.

A memorial window has recently been put in the apse of Wold Newton Church, Lincolnshire, in memory of the late Mr. William Wright, proprietor of the parish, by his sisters, Mrs. Drake and Miss Wright. It is by Messrs. Ward and Hughes, London, who have already executed three other windows for the same church.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Atkinson, Rev. Henry William, vicar of Holy Trinity, Old Hill.
Baldwin, Rev. Francis, vicar of Maltby; rector of Skegness, Lincolnshire.
Dening, Rev. Henry, vicar of German, Isle of Man.
Evans, Rev. L. H., Curate of St. Peter's Collegiate Church, Wolverhampton; vicar of Christ Church, Tunstall.
Forrester, Rev. R. B., curate, vicar of St. John's, Wolverhampton.
Grafton, Rev. Augustus William, vicar of Highbridge and Prebendary of Wells Cathedral; vicar of Castle Cary.
Kemble, Rev. Arthur, rector of Berwick Saint John, Wilts.
Lawrence, Rev. T. E., vicar of St. Mary's, Far Cotton; vicar of Walgrave, Northamptonshire.
Penley, Rev. Lionel Banks, curate of St. Mary Kidderminster; vicar of St. John's, Stourbridge.

—:o:—

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Avery, Rev. James, M.A., at Merton Vicarage, on the 7th inst., aged 36.
Edlin, Rev. William James, at Montreux, Switzerland, chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge, on the 7th inst., aged 56.
Hesse, Rev. George J., at The Lodge, Haslemere, on the 6th inst.
Lewis, Rev. Edward Freke, at Portskewett Rectory, Monmouthshire, rector of Portskewett and St. Pierre, on the 2nd inst., aged 80.
Miller, Rev. John Cale, D.D., vicar of Greenwich and canon of Rochester, on the 11th inst., aged 65.
Morris, Rev. George, at Kingskerwell, Devon, for many years vicar of that parish, on the 9th inst., aged 75.
Pemberton, Rev. Stanley, at Elmsley, Yoxford, rector of Little Hallingbury, Essex, on the 9th inst., aged 69.
Radclyffe, Rev. W. F., at Okeford Fitzpaine, near Blandford, on the 8th inst., aged 74.
Richey, Rev. J., at 1, Barton-crescent, Dawlish, late rector of Nymet St. George, North Devon, on the 6th inst., aged 81.
Seymour, Rev. Richard, at College, Worcester, canon of Worcester Cathedral, and forty years late rector of Kinwarton and Great Alne, aged 74.
Underwood, Rev. Charles E., vicar of Madley, Hereford, on the 7th inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

MAN IN THE UNIVERSE WITHOUT GOD. PESSIMISM.

BY THE
VERY REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH, D.D.,
DEAN OF LICHFIELD.

SERMON PREACHED AT ALL SOULS', LANGHAM PLACE, AT THE REQUEST OF THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY, ON SUNDAY AFTERNOON, JULY 11TH, 1880.

"For in Him we live and move and have our being."—ACTS xvii. 28.

THESE words form a part of that memorable Address delivered by St. Paul to the men of Athens. Athens was inhabited by some of the most intelligent and highly cultivated people in the world; and yet, when the Apostle visited that city, he found it wholly given to idolatry. Philosophy and literature had no power to deliver the world from creature-worship; and side by side with genius and scholarship there flourished the most degrading superstitions. It is no wonder that this strange contrast stirred the spirit of St. Paul to its very depths. Equal as he was to the very foremost of the Greek philosophers in intellect and in learning, he must have earnestly longed to lift them up to the knowledge of those higher truths in respect of which he was so vastly their superior. Not that he forgot his own nation the Jews. With these, notwithstanding their unworthy treatment of him in Thessalonica and other places, he first reasoned; and at the same time he offered himself freely in the market-place to any persons who might desire to confer with him. Here, we read, he was encountered by the Epicureans and the Stoics, two classes of philosophers least of all likely to embrace Christianity,—the one class through their sensuality, and the other through their pride. The Epicureans made the senses to be the sole criterion of truth. They denied the immortality of the soul. They were mere materialists. They held that the world came together by chance. And yet there was something even in Epicureism of which Christianity might take advantage; for it held the body to be an essential part of man's nature, and affirmed the doctrine of "free will" against the Stoic doctrines of pure spiritualism and absolute fate. The Stoics were pantheists. To them the world itself was God. They deified Nature; and so they undermined the doctrine of Providence and of judgment to come. Thus, taken together, these philosophies were the two conflicting schools which had survived other and mere abstruse speculations at the time when Christ appeared. And it was the business of Christianity to lay hold of the elements of truth which lay concealed in both, to rectify and harmonize them, and to build upon what there was of truth in them something far nobler and purer,—something which might satisfy the real cravings and undying aspirations of man. And in dealing, as the Christian apologist has to do, with the sceptical philosophy of modern times,—whether it be called positivism, or pessimism, or pantheism or agnosticism, or any other of the many forms of unbelief by which the truth is assailed in these days,—it is a great point to find out what there is of truth in the system, and carefully to distinguish it from the error by which it is overlaid and obscured. Well; some of these philosophers of both schools encountered St. Paul, and led him from the market-place to the Areopagus (the favourite resort of their greatest men) in order that they might there question him with greater formality as to his opinions. "We would know," they said, "what this new teaching whereof thou speakest is: for thou bringest certain strange things to our ears." It was a remarkable assembly. Some of the most eminent men of the most gifted nation in the world were there; and St. Paul stood alone, the advocate of an unpopular religion. But it was a great opportunity: and his address on that occasion will remain so long as the world lasts, as a standing evidence of his great resources of wisdom and knowledge. He contrives, in almost every sentence, to strike at the root of some prevailing error or prejudice amongst his hearers. And yet he studiously avoids saying anything offensive. On the contrary, he begins by complimenting the Athenians generally upon their respect for Divine things. Indeed they were so careful on this point as to draw from him the remark that they were "somewhat religious" or "somewhat superstitious."* They were not content with worshipping known gods. Rather than they should fall short in their reverence, they had erected an altar to an "unknown God." Now, this their great veneration for the gods, whether known or unknown, was a fact upon which St. Paul lays hold; and so with admirable skill he deals with the agnosticism of his day, and proceeds to enlighten them with regard to an object of worship about whom they were confessedly in the dark. Fom this point he take his departure. This inscription "to an unknown God" was a proof that their spirits had not found rest in worshipping many different objects, or no object at all. They felt that there was yet something behind the veil. The altar to an unknown God was a confession of their ignorance. And St. Paul would give a name to the anonymous inscription, even that of One who could save them from their sins, and give rest to their souls.

Now you will observe that there is nothing of bitterness, nothing of denunciation in this speech of

* The Greek word δεισιδαιμονεστέρους seems capable of either interpretation.

St. Paul. It is true that his whole object is to condemn the superstition or the unbelief of his hearers. But this he does rather indirectly than directly. There is no invective, no assumption, no arrogance in his words. He calmly but earnestly pleads for truth. He reminds the Athenians that their own poets Aratus and Cleanthes had told them that they were the "offspring of God;" and therefore it was a mistake to suppose that they could fashion anything like unto the Divine Majesty, beautiful though some of their statues were,—like that masterpiece of Greek art, the figure of Minerva by Phidias, which stood in front of him on that far-famed hill from whence he was addressing them.

Now all this shows us that in dealing with men in error, it is a great point to start from some known principle which they hold in common with you. It has, I think, been too much the custom, in contending against error, to treat your opponent as though you differed from him in everything. Whereas, if you study the examples of Holy Scripture, you will find that the rule is rather to find the points of agreement, and to build up upon those acknowledged truths which each side holds an argument against the particular error which you desire to refute. You see that this is precisely the kind of reasoning employed by St. Paul. He sees before him the renowned statue of Minerva. He appreciates the skill and genius of the artist; but at the same time he is uncompromising in his condemnation of idolatry. He had noticed amongst their objects of worship an altar "to an unknown God." He employs that altar as his weapon of assault against their superstitions. For it was that God, hitherto unknown by them, but nevertheless the God in whom they lived and moved and had their being,—it was that God whom he was now declaring to them.

But further; you will see that the stress of St. Paul's argument is laid upon the fact of creation. And I want to shew you why it is laid there and not elsewhere. Now it is wonderful to see what can be produced by the genius and skill of man. No one can visit our schools of art, and not marvel at the beautiful and ingenious things which our skilled artisans, our sculptors and inventors will produce out of the rudest material; and it is quite possible that things yet more beautiful and wonderful might be produced even by finite power and wisdom, were that power and wisdom augmented. But I am now speaking of the act of creation, in the primary meaning of that word, namely, the making of things at first out of nothing. God, indeed, is continually creating; for if He were to withhold His hand, if His sustaining power were to cease for a moment, everything would drop into that nothingness out of which it sprang at His bidding. I speak then, now, of the original creation of matter out of nothing. I dismiss, not only as contrary to Revelation, but as absurd and preposterous, as full of contradictions, the notion that matter is eternal. Reduce it, if you will, to its minutest atoms, an atom being something so small as to be incapable of subdivision, and quite invisible. Imagine these atoms, diffused through the vast æther around us, to be the primordial elements out of which the heavens and the earth were created. Let these atoms be proved to be absolutely unchangeable; but capable, by combination in various proportions, and in different orders amongst themselves, of producing the various substances of which the Universe is composed. Still the question haunts me, Where did these atoms come from? They must have had a beginning. They could not have made themselves. And thus I am brought into the presence of a Power antecedent to these atoms and independent of them; an infinite Power—spirit and not matter, which called them into being. And so, as it seems to me, when you have, as it were, hunted nature down to the infinitesimal point—the minute, invisible, unchanging atom,—this little atom, no less wonderful in its composition than the universe itself—this little atom, which contains within itself the mystery of a universe,—this little atom pleads for Deity, it bears witness to the existence of a Creator; and so we stand, after this close and searching analysis of Nature, face to face with Nature's God.

I say, then, that creation is a Divine act. I contend that no power short of an infinite power could have made the original material of the Universe. That is my starting-point. You see at once the difference between making the material, and afterwards making use of that material, working it up into other forms. You may say that the Universe moves by laws impressed upon it from the beginning; and I am not going to dispute that point. But this does not answer my question, Who made matter at first out of nothing, and impressed upon its elementary particles those laws which they have obeyed through the ages past, ever since they were created? There is no answer but one to this. The creation of matter at first demands nothing less than an infinite, that is, a Divine power—a mind absolutely independent of the matter to be created—and in Whose Book all created things "were written, when as yet there was none of them."

It will be seen from what I have said that there are two extremes to be avoided in contemplating the creation of the Universe. (1) There are those who have thought that the Universe has come into being as we see it, by the fortuitous motions of senseless matter; that the mighty system around us, a system which bears the evidence everywhere of design and of order, came to be what it is, in the roll of countless ages, by the chance meeting of atoms. Such reasonings were well answered by a heathen philosopher nineteen centuries ago. "The man," says Cicero, "who believes that this most beautiful and well appointed world could have been formed by the fortuitous concourse of atoms, might just as soon believe that if a countless number of letters of the alphabet,—

whether of gold or of any other substance,—were thrown together anywhere, it would be possible that out of them, when shaken out upon the earth, the annals of Ennius could be produced, so that they might forthwith be read in order."* (2) The other extreme is that of those who think it necessary that the Divine Creator should work everything directly, of Himself, without using any intermediate agency.

The middle view between these extremes is that which is taught us by science, and is not contradicted by Revelation; namely this, that when God created the elements of matter, He, foreseeing what it was His purpose to fashion through the ages to come, imparted to those elements certain properties and powers, by which they are continually evolving His will, acting regularly according to those laws which He has given them; and all working for ends which though not understood by the things created, are nevertheless understood and intended by that perfect Mind on which they depend. And thus it is true that neither are all things performed immediately by God Himself, nor do they come to pass fortuitously, but regularly for the sake of ends, by that supreme and infinite Power in which we and all creatures "live and move and have our being."

And here I cannot help observing, by the way, how wonderfully the Bible adapts itself to the gradual developments of science. The Bible was not designed to teach us science. It was necessary, in order to the revelation of the plan of salvation, that the Bible should give us in few words, by way of introduction, a history of the origin of man and of his present dwelling-place. What it says however of natural things, whether here or elsewhere, is but the surrounding of its great theme,—the "setting," so to speak, of this "pearl of great price." And yet in these surroundings, in these allusions, often incidental, to natural things, there is a simplicity, an accuracy, an elasticity, which is marvellous, — marvellous in this respect, that as in the course of ages new discoveries in science have been made, the Bible is still beforehand with the discovery; and its old language is found to acquire a new meaning, which harmonizes with those new discoveries; and this is to my mind one of the most powerful supplemental evidences that the God of Nature and of Revelation is one and the same.

And now how melancholy how dismal and hopeless is his prospect, who unhappily is living without God in His own Universe; and who, by one or other of those mental processes by which in all ages men have been deceived, has persuaded himself, either that there is no God, or that if there is a God, He is unknowable; and that as to this world, although the human race may continue and advance to higher degrees of perfection, there is no future for the individual man beyond this present life; that upon the dissolution of the atoms of which he is composed, his whole being, body and soul will vanish into nothing; that there is no Providence over him, no merciful and all-powerful Protector; that the mighty forces of nature which surround him are all directed by chance; and that he is in hopeless bondage to atheistic fate or material necessity. Epicurus, we are told, thought to shed a little light over his gloomy theory, by introducing into this infidel hypothesis the somewhat contradictory principle of the free will of man. But then this free will could not extend beyond man himself; it was a power over man himself only, and not over things without him. And so the philosopher, with all the props which he invented to support his principles, is said to have been himself sometimes in a panic, lest the mighty mechanism of the Universe should suddenly give way, and the forces which hold it in equilibrium should be set free, and the disengaged atoms of matter be dispersed through the vast surrounding æther. Such is the prospect of man without God in the Universe. It has been said the design of Atheism is to set men free from fear.† But is this a theory calculated to remove fear? Disguise it as you will, it deprives a man of all faith, or hope, or confidence. So in seeking to escape from fear, he flies into the arms of fear. For he who is without hope, without well-grounded hope, can never be free from fear. Indeed Atheism itself springs from the imposture of fear. It is a timorous distrust and disbelief of things not seen, and of good to be looked for hereafter, namely of an invisible and omnipotent Being, who exercises a kind, and just, and merciful Providence over all those who commit their ways to Him, and with an endeavour to please Him; whereas Atheism has its root in the secret desire that there should be no God, a wish which grows out of the dread of Him to Whose justice man knows himself to be obnoxious.‡

Brethren, there is a sceptical philosophy which in every age has had some adherents, and in these our days has grown into a school of thought which now numbers many disciples, more especially in Germany. This philosophy, which is called Pessimism, is chiefly identified with the names of Schopenhauer and Hartman. And what are its principles? That this world is as bad as it can possibly be to exist at all; and that life in this world is something most unworthy and unsatisfying; and that the one remedy for human woes is either to abandon life, or to reduce ourselves to mere passive spectators of the world, caring nothing for its interests or occupations, until death shall come, not as leading to a better state; but as putting an end for ever to a condition of continual unhappiness and unrest.

I will not trouble you with any detailed metaphysical explanations of this dreary philosophy. It conceives of the world as "Will and Intellectual Representation." Existence at all, according to this philosopy, is a mistake, a blunder; and it owes its origin to the blind and uncontrollable impulses of an irrational "Will;" the only remedy for which

* Cicero de nat. Deorum Lib. II. 37.

† τέλος τοῦ μὴ νομίζειν Θεοὺς, νὴ φοβεῖσθαι

‡ Cudworth. Intellectual System of the Universe.

is to resist it, and to remain passive until this melancholy existence is passed, and we vanish away as a dream.*

Oh! how different is this from the Christian's view of the present life! We admit, indeed, that there is much evil and misery in this present world, and that our life here is a wandering in a strange country. But then we believe also that evil is not a permanent and indestructible element of existence. We believe that it is not due to a blind force called "Will," but that it is the result of man's wilful departure from God; and that it can only be eradicated by a voluntary return of the race to its Creator. We believe moreover, that this earth, even in its degraded condition, is under the protection of infinite love and wisdom; and that the just and the unjust are alike the recipients of the Divine bounty. Thus to the child of God even the present life offers much to be thankful for; not only because we recognize a Father's hand in every sorrow as well as in every joy; but also because we have the conciousness of spiritual union with Him through Christ; and the elevating hope of perfect bliss in the world to come. Then further we feel that our present existence, chequered though it is by the lights and shadows of prosperity and adversity, is a necessary preparatory discipline for the life to come; and there is finally the promise that this world shall be ultimately recovered for its rightful King. So that a new value and a new impulse are given to our present existence, in the thought that we, each one of us, have it in our power to contribute something towards the final triumph of good over evil.

There is one important consideration which I would submit to those who may feel present doubts with regard to these great realities. Let me assume for a moment that I am to perish with the brutes—that death is annihilation. Did it never occur to you, on such a supposition, that so inadequate are the objects which we see around us to satisfy our desires—that so insufficient is the present life for filling up the capacities of the soul, that, if it be indeed true that not only the body but the soul also is to be extinguished at death, then there has been a great waste of power in my construction? It can hardly be denied by those who at all reflect upon themselves, that whether or not they are to live hereafter they are at least capable of living hereafter. I say that he is unworthy to be called a man who does not at least feel that he might be immortal. No one can have exercised his thinking faculties, or given play to the various powers of his soul, and not feel that he has a capacity for an endless life. I will assume then, that with these rich mental endowments, these endowments for ages, his destiny is only to live for threescore years and ten. Be it so. But then I contend that man is the only created being, as far as I am aware, with capacities and faculties never to be occupied or employed to the full. It may be so. But then I may reasonably ask, Why this magnificent outfit? To what purpose this comprehensiveness of reason, this prodigality of powers, this grasp of memory, this vigour of imagination, this restless activity of hope and desire, this ability to communicate with the invisible? Can it be that the possessor of these high endowments is to enjoy them for only a few brief years; and that then, notwithstanding this noble equipment, this wonderful apparatus of intellectual power, he is to pass into that nothingness out of which he came? Oh! no. This rich provision is on too grand a scale for so brief a journey. It tells me that this life is but the halting-place at the gates of eternity. It tells me that I am born for immortality. It tells me, if indeed I am a believer, that though flesh and heart fail, yet "God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever."

And thus I touch the great difference between man *without* God, and man *with* God in the Universe. To have God with us, is to feel safe and secure both for time and for eternity. There is no good thing which may not be hoped for by a good man from God. With Him, there is the promise of whatever happiness we are capable of; and that, for ever. The hopes which lie before us are infinite For He on Whom we depend is infinitely good and powerful; and nothing can hinder or obstruct these hopes but our own wilful choice of evil rather than good.

Look once more at these words of the great Apostle in my text. "In Him we live and move and have our being." He preserves our life, our soul, our essence, by always influencing them in us, even as He first created them; just as the sun preserves his rays by a continuous emission and a continuous production of them. We live and move in Him as in the boundless æther. Within Him we stand and dwell. He penetrates us with His essence. We cannot escape from Him, we so live in Him and of Him that we cannot live without Him. And thus as we are joined to Him naturally so ought we also to be joined to Him spiritually. And then, immortality becomes, not a form of future existence, but strictly proper to our present life. If we associate ourselves in thought with the Divine Being, we partake of His immortality. We then feel that even in this narrow finite world we are one with the Infinite and the Eternal. Oh! that we may escape from the bondage of doubt, and the shadow and darkness of things present, and take hold with strong faith of that Hand, that pierced Hand, which is stretched out to us from within the veil; and which alone can guide us through things temporal to things eternal. "Whom have I in heaven but Thee, and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of Thee!"

* See "Pessimism," a History and a Criticism, by James Sully, M.A.

GOD'S CARE FOR THE HELPLESS.

By the Rev. J. F. BATEMAN, M.A.,
Rector of North and South Lopham, and Formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached at St. James's Church, Bury St. Edmund's, on Thursday, 8th July, 1880.

"The Lord careth for the strangers; He defendeth the fatherless and widow."—Psalm cxlvi. 9.

THESE words present Almighty God to our view in one of His innumerable aspects of loving-kindness and pity, as One Who cares for strangers, and Who can and will defend the widow and the orphan. Let us first think of some recorded instances of the way in which God cares for the stranger, and of the means which He uses to defend the fatherless and widow; and then let us ask ourselves, in all reverence and humility, whether we cannot find a way of working with Him for a like object.

There was once a stranger in the land of Midian by the name of Moses, and God cared for him. He fled there, he became a stranger there through no fault of his own. He was brought up, as you know, in all the ease and luxury of the Egyptian Court, a favourite adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter. But his heart was with his own people, and when he was grown up he went out unto his brethren, and looked on their burdens. Carried away by his righteous indignation, he slew an Egyptian whom he saw smiting a poor defenceless Hebrew, one of the strangers in the land where he (Moses) might have become a Prince, and then, to escape the vengeance of Pharaoh, he fled into the land of Midian. Here again we find him a champion of the oppressed, taking the part of the daughters of Jethro against some shepherds of the country, who would have driven them away from the well where they wished to water their father's flock. God had not lost sight of Moses in this strange land, but was caring for him just as he so gladly shewed his care for others. God gave him favour in the sight of Jethro, who granted him his daughter Zipporah to wife. She bare him a son, we are told, and "he called his name Gershom, for he said, I have been a stranger in a strange land."

But this was not all. Far higher honour and distinction awaited him even while a stranger in this land of Midian. God spoke to him on Mount Horeb, and with His own voice commissioned him to lead Israel out of Egypt into the long-promised land of Canaan. He said He had seen the affliction of His people in Egypt. He had looked upon them; had had respect unto them; was caring for them as *strangers*, and strangers in a double sense, not only as being dwellers in a country not their own, but as being unacquainted with Him Who was all the time loving them, and planning for their welfare.

There was a time, my dear friends, when all of us were strangers to God. We were all conceived and born in sin, inheritors of the corrupt, fallen nature of Adam, and about to grow up, if left to our own devices, without the faintest desire to know God, or to be known of Him. But God cared for us. He put it into the hearts of our parents and friends to bring us, while helpless infants, to Holy Baptism, to bring us, as far as they could do so, out of the dominion and kingdom of Satan, and enrol us among Christ's followers; among those for whom and in whose place He died upon the cross, when He suffered the penalty due to our sins, and for ever made Atonement for our transgressions. God cared for us strangers when He induced our parents and teachers to spend many weary hours perhaps in teaching us, as we grew up, how to use our baptismal privileges, thus gradually, imperceptibly perhaps to them, converting and changing us, as I trust I may say of all here present, by the blessed agency of the Holy Spirit from a state of strangeness and hatred towards God into a state of loving reverence and affectionate obedience.

I spoke just now of Moses and what he did for "strangers." Let me, in a rapid but not unjustifiable transition, ask you to carry your thoughts onward through Scripture history some sixteen centuries, and briefly notice the words and feelings of one other man, who lovingly shewed his care for strangers and pilgrims who had been called out of darkness into God's marvellous light. He of whom I speak grew up to manhood a stranger to Jesus, not knowing Him to be the Messiah till he was called to be an Apostle; and in one sad hour of his subsequent life he spoke of Jesus as a stranger to himself! Overcome by terror in the High Priest's house lest he should be identified with the followers of Christ, he began to curse and to swear, saying "I know not the man." But Peter's fall, though sad, was not fatal to his soul. His Master's look recalled him in an instant. He went out and wept bitterly for his fault, and from that moment, with fresh earnestness, but with tenfold more humility, he devoted himself to the service of his forgiving Lord. How manfully did he stand up before the Sanhedrim (Acts iv.); before Annas and Caiaphas, and John and Alexander, and all the powerful kindred of the High Priest, and magnify the name of Jesus of Nazareth, Whom they had crucified and slain, but Whom God had raised from the dead. How touchingly and affectionately did he begin his well-known Epistle, by addressing himself to "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," and how beautifully and encouragingly does he proceed to remind them, that they, though once like sheep going astray, have returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls, have listened to His voice and calling, and have purified their souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren.

Simon Peter, our Lord Jesus Christ, and Moses the servant of God, cared thus for *strangers*. Another, who once stood with these three on the Mount of Transfiguration, *Elijah*, the mighty chosen prophet of the Lord, was once allowed by God miraculously to support a *widow and her son*. The almost empty barrel of meal did not waste, nor did the well-nigh exhausted cruse of oil fail, from the day that Elijah entered the house of Sarepta to the day when it pleased God to send rain upon the earth. And not only was Elijah allowed to preserve the widow and her son from starvation, but after the child had been suddenly cut off by disease Elijah was permitted to restore him to life again, and to deliver him to his mother. The woman, overcome by gratitude, at once recognized the work of the Author of all good, of Him "who careth for strangers, and defendeth the fatherless and widow," and exclaimed, "Now by this I know that thou art a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in thy mouth is truth."

Is it our wish to be recognized as children of God, as imitators of the Almighty loving Father of us all? Is it our desire to make even an unbelieving world admit the loving kindness of our Master, by seeing however faintly reproduced in us His compassionate regard, His ever-watchful care to alleviate suffering and pain? Your attendance here this day shows that such *is* your wish and desire, and presently I will point out how that good desire may be brought to good effect.

But before doing so I should like briefly to allude to one thought connected with our subject. Almighty God, as we have seen, delights in defending the fatherless and widow when they are reduced to that melancholy condition. Is it not rather natural to ask, somewhat in the spirit of those Jews (John xi. 37) who saw Jesus weeping on account of the death of Lazarus, and said "Could not this man, who opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that this man should not have died?" Is it not rather natural I say for us to ask, "Why does God so often allow these afflictions to arise at all?" I will answer the enquiry with a quotation from the journal of a good Christian man, the Rev. W. Pennefather, who said that "he had been struck with an expression in Deuteronomy, viii. 3, referring to the Israelites in the wilderness:—*He suffered them to hunger and fed them;* as shewing us how trial brings out God's power to deliver. He caused Israel in the desert to feel the pangs of want, only that He might daily work a marvellous miracle on their behalf. They never would have tasted angel's food had they not first been suffered to hunger. And not only would they have lost a precious lesson, but God's people in all ages would have missed the instruction which our Blessed Master has given us (John vi.) in connection with the manna. Thus their trials, through God's mercy, have proved an inestimable blessing to the whole Church of Christ."

The trials, pecuniary and otherwise, of some of those persons who are assisted by the excellent Society I plead for to-day, will, in like manner, not have been sent in vain, if the thought induces us who are more fortunate in earthly matters to make some effort to help them. May the thought make us all not merely give some small coin to-day grudgingly and of necessity, but may we give cheerfully, gladly, and as a thank-offering to Almighty God.

Do let me beg of you all to give liberally this day in support of "the Charity for the Relief of Poor Widows and Orphans of Clergymen in Suffolk." This is no new untried Society. It was first founded in 1704, one hundred and seventy-six years ago, and in the year 1742 was incorporated by Royal Charter. General Courts are held three times a year for distributing the funds in hand among the needy widows and orphans of clergymen who have ministered in the County of Suffolk, and though it is of course difficult for me, even though a *Norfolk* clergyman, to advocate the claims of the class to which I belong, I feel sure that on this occasion I express the feelings of all sincere lay-members of our Protestant Church in saying that the widows and orphans of her clergy have a very real claim upon your liberality and support, and that if you wish to imitate and work with God who defends the fatherless and widow of every country, you cannot do better than help through this Society, the widows and orphans of those clergymen whom you have probably known by name and reputation, and by whose religious ministrations some of you here present have perhaps been personally benefited. The Church of Rome as you know forbids her clergy to marry. The members of our Reformed Protestant Church not only encourage their ministers to marry, but sometimes shew so much kindly interest in a matter which undoubtedly promotes the happiness and usefulness of a clergyman, that they encourage him to marry sooner than the dictates of prudence would recommend.

This, however, is not a subject which I should like to pursue further on the present occasion, for fear of inadvertently causing pain to any person who, by an imprudent marriage, had become one of the recipients of your bounty. Our object this day is to take things as we find them; and knowing, as we do, that many excellent clergymen of the County of Suffolk have, in the mysterious providence of God, been called away before they have been able to make due provision for those dear ones whom they have left behind, I ask each of you, according to your means, to contribute gladly to the funds of this excellent Society, which does so much to alleviate the distress caused by bereavements such as I have spoken of. I am quite sure that you will never regret helping so good a cause as this, yourselves, and I will ask you further to make the Society known among your friends, so as to increase, if possible, the number of annual subscribers. Charitable institutions like this, are the

glory of our native land. They offer opportunities for all to work for Christ—the fountain-head of all charity and compassion—with their *money*, their *personal exertions*, and their *prayers;* the *money* being given in gratitude to Him who though rich for our sakes became poor; the *personal exertions* being rendered in humble imitation of Him who went about doing good to the bodies and souls of men; the *prayers* being offered in the spirit of Him who prayed the Father not to leave His loved ones comfortless, but by sending the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, to make up for bereavement and isolation for a time.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 24, 1880.

WE are happy to be able to lay before our readers another of the sermons preached at the instance of the Christian Evidence Society. Inasmuch as it deals with its subject "MAN IN THE UNIVERSE WITHOUT GOD" in a very able and Christian manner, it is of especial value at the present time, when a number of so-called Christians have deliberately selected Mr. Bradlaugh as their Representative and Lawgiver. We wish it could have been preached at Northampton as well as in London. After an elaborate and well-sustained argument, we think the Dean of Lichfield has been singularly happy and practical in his deduction, "that as we are joined to God naturally, so ought we to be joined to Him spiritually. And then, immortality becomes, not a form of future existence, but strictly proper to our present life." We take it to be a grave practical error to regard, as is commonly done by Christians not by Mohammedans, man as having two separate and distinct spiritual lives, one present and one future; whereas it is really one and the same continuous life. The fact that the body passes through one of its appointed physical changes called death cannot of necessity make a breach of continuity in the spiritual life. We are rightly taught that the life and happiness of the soul, like the life and happiness of the body in its past present and future generations, is regulated entirely by its antecedent actions. We cannot therefore too early realize that the immortality of the soul has truly begun in the present life, as it is called. In this matter Christians may learn much from the despised and ignorant Turk, whose superior morality, health, and happiness, we attribute to the fact that his religion is a present practical reality, he obeys it in every particular, is in constant communion with God, and lives entirely for the next and more enduring world. His manners, customs and civilization are all made subservient to the attainment of immortal life, and consequently offer many lessons to the practical Christian. His civilization may not be suited to the present age, just as a pure theocracy, strange as it may seem, is a form of Government wholly unsuited to modern Christians; but it has many advantages in promoting health, happiness and a contented spirit. The politeness of the Turk is proverbial and he is truly said to be a born gentleman.

ST. PETER'S, BOURNEMOUTH.

We are requested to print the following letter, addressed by Sir Henry Taylor to Lord Blachford:—

"My dear Blachford—You regard the troubles of the Church with a more undisturbed judgment than any other person I know who is so much interested in them, and there is a church here not altogether unknown to you — St. Peter's, Bournemouth — whose troubles I desire to bring before you for the chance that you may be able to suggest some mode of deliverance. A lay advowson is at the root of them, the lay patron being apparently determined to present a Low Church clergyman to minister in a church which is almost filled exclusively with a High Church congregation.

"Our vicar, Mr. Bennett, died about six months ago. He was a man who, without any extraordinary abilities, had exercised for, I think, about thirty years, through force of character, generosity, and a governed ardour, extraordinary powers. The grand church of St. Peter's was built by his efforts, and he may be said to have created the congregation. He built and endowed several affiliated churches in the neighbourhood, with parsonages, Mission-houses, and schools; and it was, perhaps, in no small measure due to him that Bournemouth rose from being a small sea-side village to be a first-rate watering-place. We were all devoted to him, and the spiritual influence he exercised may be attributed to his moderation not less than to his unintermitting energies. High Churchman as he was, he was regarded with admiration and a friendly respect by his Low Church

neighbours. His Diocesan, the Bishop of Winchester, considered some of his practices as not strictly legal; but, 'thinking none of them very important, and knowing all the good work he was doing, and the love which his people had for him,' he was 'not inclined to take any steps, or to encourage others to take any steps, to oblige him to give up what he and they valued so much.'

"So all went well until the day of his death.

"But hardly was the breath out of his body when the three curates and the congregation learnt with dismay that a clergyman understood to hold opposite opinions had been selected for the living. He came and, rather to our surprise, expressed his satisfaction and even his delight with everything that he found in use, and his intention to make no change. He remained with us till a week or two ago as vicar-designate but not actually instituted, and then he announced that there were ten practices which were illegal, and which, on that ground, he must abolish; and he quoted the authority of the Bishop. A deputation waited upon the Bishop with a memorial signed by one thousand—more or less—members of the congregation of St. Peter's and other affiliated churches, and were assured by his lordship that, although when called upon to state what practices were legal and what were not he had felt it his duty to do so, he had not himself any desire that changes should be made, and he had required the vicar-designate to contradict a paragraph which had been put into the *Times* and the *Guardian*, which implied that the vicar-designate had acted under pressure from him.

"Under these circumstances it was hardly possible that the vicar-designate should remain, and he announced his resignation.

"So far, well. But, as I have said, the root of the evil was in the lay advowson, and it is now stated that another Low Churchman, Dr. Ryan, some time Bishop of Mauritius, has been selected to be Mr. Harland's successor; and all our troubles are renewed.

"Such is the case which I have wished to put before you as an extreme example of the evils of lay patronage, or at least of lay patronage in private hands. In the hands of a Lord Chancellor, or a Prime Minister, it would be almost sure to be administered with a large appreciation of results, and there are few Bishops who would be wanting in the like appreciation. In the hands of this or that country squire, the feelings, and with the feelings the spiritual welfare, of a large congregation may be dealt with at pleasure.

"I am not so much distressed as many are at divisions in the Church. Lord Bacon has spoken some wise words on the subject:—'It must be remembered that the Church of God hath been in all ages subject to contentions and schisms. . . . . Our Saviour Christ delivered it for an ill note to have outward peace, saying, *when a strong man is in possession of the house*, meaning the devil, *all things are in peace*. . . . . Reason teaches us that in ignorance and implied belief it is easy to agree, as colours agree in the dark; or if any country decline into atheism, then controversies wax dainty, because men do think religion scarce worth the falling out for; so it is weak divinity to account controversies an ill sign in the Church.' I am entirely of Lord Bacon's mind in this; but I think it should be added that when controversies prevail then it is needful, above all things, that there should be a mediating power at work, and that this is to be looked for in the Bishops, and not in the country squires.

Ever yours, "HENRY TAYLOR.

"P.S.—I may add that in this case the lay-patron contributes only £50 per annum to the endowment."

A meeting, convened by the churchwardens, was held at St. Peter's Boys' School-room on Wednesday evening, to receive a letter announcing the appointment of Bishop Ryan to St. Peter's vicarage. There was a very large attendance, including a number of ladies.

Mr. W. W. Moore was voted to the chair. He said the meeting had been called to consider a letter written by Sir George Meyrick to the churchwardens announcing the appointment of the Right Rev. Bishop Ryan to the vicarage of St. Peter's. He would call upon one of the churchwardens to read the letter. Dr. Salt then read the following letter:—

"Bodorgan, Langefin, North Wales, July 9, 1880.

"To the Churchwardens of St. Peter's, Bournemouth.

"Gentlemen,—I beg to inform you that I have presented the Right Rev. Bishop Ryan to the vicarage of St. Peter's, and that he has accepted the living. I feel very thankful that I have been able to obtain for you such an able and excellent man, and I sincerely hope he may be a great blessing to Bournemouth.—I am, gentlemen, your faithful servant, GEORGE MEYRICK."

The Chairman then said that, in the absence of any member of the congregation of St. Peter's of longer standing than himself, or who was better known, he had been asked to take the chair that evening. The main object of that meeting, and one which principally concerned the worshippers of St. Peter's Church, was the maintenance of the present spiritual teaching of the glorious and beautiful services which they had so long enjoyed. These services were brought to their perfection by their late lamented vicar, Mr. Bennett, and by those who ministered under him. They had been bequeathed to them along with the noble church raised by his pious hands—bequeathed as a precious legacy which they might not lightly abandon. Those services, he was happy to say, were very dear to them all—certainly to the very large majority of the congregation of St. Peter's and its affiliated churches. These services were strictly within the principles of the Church of England, and he believed that they commanded the general and hearty approval of the Bishop of the diocese. They were not only dear to them, but they were also dear to many who, in former years, had spent the winter in Bournemouth, and in whose minds the memory of lost and loved relations who now rested in the churchyard was connected; and they were, beyond that, unquestionably a strong attraction to many good Churchpeople from different parts of England, who came here in search of health for themselves or their relatives. To themselves they were great and inestimable privileges which they valued highly, and to be deprived of them would be an incalculable loss. There was another reason for calling that meeting, and in importance it was, perhaps, greater than the one he had just ventured to name. It concerned not only the welfare of St. Peter's, but the well-being of the community of Bournemouth at large, and that was the maintenance of peace and harmony in the parish. They all knew what a peaceful time they had under the late lamented vicar, and how they enjoyed his ministrations and the services in St. Peter's Church. They felt that if any changes were made troublous times would be in store for them, that divisions must inevitably occur, that secessions must take place, and they must all tremble for the future of St. Peter's, and also of Bournemouth itself. The presentation of the living was in the hands of Sir George Meyrick, who had, by law, an unques-

tionable right to nominate whom he pleased to the living. They did not question that right. It was a matter which rested with Sir George and his own conscience, and they might be sure that he had not without earnest prayer and due consideration fulfilled the important trust committed to his charge. He approached the name of Bishop Ryan with great respect, and with the reverence due to one of his high position in the Church of England. He was a man eminent for piety, eminent for learning and for activity in Church work; he had long fulfilled the position of Bishop in the Mauritius, had lately had the charge of a populous parish in the north of England, and, as Archdeacon of Craven, had rendered valuable service to the Bishop of his diocese. He was a gentlemen under whose ministrations it would be a privilege to attend, if it were not for one fact, that his opinions on religious subjects were diametrically in opposition to their own. They knew Bishop Ryan as a public man, they knew his public character, and they had assured themselves, from the best private information, that his views were those of a strict Evangelical Churchman, and that he could not conscientiously approve of the services of St. Peter's, and they could not hope that he would be one who, as vicar, would continue Mr. Bennett's work. The greater his talents, the greater his zeal, and the greater his conscientiousness, so much the greater the danger that he could not possibly continue their services, and that sweeping changes would be made. It would be an injustice to themselves, and a still greater injustice to Bishop Ryan, if they did not frankly and fairly inform him of the divergencies between their opinions. They wished to do it with all Christian courtesy and with Christian humility, and they hoped it would not be without effect. He had now ventured to explain to them the two objects of that meeting; but might he say one word more? He hoped they would approach the discussion that evening with the most perfect calmness, and without uttering one word which would cause pain to anybody, and which, on the morrow, they themselves would regret. Let them lay aside the past, and confine their deliberation only to the present and future. A great and momentous issue awaited them, which was neither more or less than the peace and harmony of the parish for some years to come, and it was their duty, in the most courteous way, to lay before Bishop Ryan the extreme differences of their views. In conclusion he would ask them to picture to their imagination that the spirit of their departed vicar was amongst them that night, taking, as he always did, a deep and lively interest in their spiritual welfare; if they did that they would take care that nothing escaped their lips that would be displeasing to him, or that would not have his entire approval and sanction.

Mr. F. C. Hyde said before he proposed the resolution he would read to them the following memorial respecting the appointment of Bishop Ryan:

"Memorial as to the recent Nomination to St. Peter's Vicarage, Bournemouth.

"We, the undersigned members of the congregations of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, and its affiliated churches, have heard with sorrow that the Right Rev. Bishop Ryan, vicar of Bradford, has now been nominated to the incumbancy of St. Peter's parish.

"While we do not doubt the zeal and earnestness and thorough honesty of the new vicar-nominate, these characteristics do but increase our fears, lest his well-known leaning to principles diametrically opposed to those which have been, for upwards of thirty years, cherished by our late beloved vicar, and his large congregation, may probably uproot all that we hold most dear, and may entirely deprive us of those aids to spiritual life and personal religion which we have been taught to value most deeply.

"The English Church has always allowed a breadth both of teaching and practice. The principles so well represented by Bishop Ryan are fully maintained in other Churches of this town. Consequently, it would be a grievous hardship (besides being a manifest injustice to Bishop Ryan himself) were he, by his coming, to create in the midst of our peaceful and united congregation disturbance and disquietude, in the name of the Gospel of Peace.

"We therefore respectfully pray that the Right Rev. Bishop Ryan may see fit to withdraw his acceptance of the vicarage of St. Peter's, Bournemouth."

Having read that he would, without any remarks of his own, propose the following resolution:—

"That the memorial prepared by the provisional committee be adopted by this meeting, and be circulated for signature amongst the congregation of St. Peter's and its affiliated churches, and then forwarded to Bishop Ryan."

Mr. W. S. Evans seconded the resolution, and said he fully concurred with what had been said by the chairman in his opening remarks. They all must agree with the patron when he said that Bishop Ryan was a very able and excellent man; but they did not feel he was the man to carry on the grand work which their late vicar matured. He was of a school of thought different from that which they had been educated in, and while in one sense they appreciated his teaching they hoped that he would retire from this sphere for one where he would be more useful.

The Chairman then put the resolution, which was carried unanimously, as was the following:—

"That a deputation, consisting of the churchwardens, together with Colonel Hay and Mr. D. Sydenham, do wait upon Bishop Ryan at Bradford, as soon as the memorial shall have received a sufficient number of signatures, and present such memorial to the Bishop, enforcing its prayer by their urgent personal remonstrances."

Reviews and Notices.

"A Church of England Hymn Book, adapted to the Daily Services of the Church throughout the Year." Compiled and Edited by the Rev. Godfrey Thring, Rector of Alford-with-Hornblotton, Prebendary of Wells Cathedral. London: W. Skeffington & Son. 1880. Pp. 722.

That the author of such deservedly admired hymns as "The radiant morn hath passed away," "Fierce raged the Tempest o'er the deep," "Saviour, Blessed Saviour listen while we sing," and "O God of mercy God of might" should succeed in a work of selecting and arranging Sacred Poetry is what would naturally be expected, and Mr. Godfrey Thring has amply justified this expectation in his new *Church of England Hymn Book;* exhibitiug therein purity of taste and judicious discernment. Many will doubt, whether a new publication of spiritual songs is necessary or expedient, when such collections as *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, (now so much in use that it is frequently bound up with the Prayer Book), *Hymnal Companion* and *Church Hymns*, to say nothing of *Common Praise*,

published by the Christian Book Society, and numerous other hymn books of minor importance, are already dividing amongst them a field in which unity of thought, and feeling in the singing of hymns, as well as in prayer and ritual, is not only "meet and right" but absolutely essential in these days, when the desire for the destruction of the Established Church is so distinctly evident. In the interest of those, more especially in the metropolis, who are by force of circumstances prevented from attending the same place of worship constantly, it is to be hoped that ere long the representatives of the different parties, who unfortunately paralyse to a certain extent the authority of the Church by their dissentions, will sanction an authorised Hymnal to form a fitting appendix to our Book of Common Prayer culling their selection from the abundant sources of private research and enterprise which they now have at their disposal. We hope that Mr. Thring when he has time and opportunity will continue the preparations he speaks of in his preface for the publication of a book of tunes; for to leave the selection of appropriate tunes for hymns entirely to organists,—a class of persons who, even when professionals, are not, with a few brilliant exceptions, the best judges of the harmony which should exist between music and words—is often highly detrimental to the just appreciation of the words themselves.

The present Lord Chancellor in his well-known *Book of Praise*, a work of its kind unrivalled for purity of text, says "It has been his desire and aim to adhere strictly in *all* cases in which it could be ascertained to the genuine uncorrupted text of the authors themselves," and although in a work intended for general use in a Church, this rule may not be always advisable or even possible, yet in justice to the writers themselves it ought to be carried out to its fullest reasonable extent. The compiler of the work before us has, he says, followed this rule, "with the chief exception of venturing to change some of those over-familiar epithets, which are often applied to our Blessed Lord." That he has been sometimes strangely inconsistent may be gathered from what follows: Father Faber's well-known hymn commencing

"Sweet Saviour bless us ere we go,"

is in Mr. Thring's book changed to

"*O* Saviour bless us ere we go;"

and the first line of the third verse in the same hymn,

"Grant us, *dear* Lord, from evil ways;"

is improved in the Rector of Hornblotton's opinion thus,

"Grant us, *O* Lord, from evil ways."

Yet we find on turning to the very next hymn the objectionable epithet in the opening couplet,

"Saviour again to thy *dear* Name we raise
With one accord our parting hymn of praise."

and again two pages further on we notice Keble's beautiful hymn,

"Son of my soul, Thou Saviour *dear*,
It is not night if Thou be near;"

is allowed to remain intact. If the word "dear" when applied to Christ is "over-familiar" in one hymn, it must be so in another, and the mere fact of its forming the last word in a line is no excuse for its continuance. To us the alterations pointed out are unjustifiable and absurd when Pryne's hymn,

"Jesu, *meek* and *gentle!*
Son of God Most High!
Pitying, *Loving* Saviour!
Hear Thy childrens' cry,"

stands untouched. Indeed such strange vagaries with the original text suggests grave errors on the part of the printer, or a captious and purile vacillation of thought in the learned editor, for which it is difficult to account.

The absence of one or two well-known hymns are due, the compiler says, to the refusal by the editors of "Hymns Ancient and Modern," to allow the insertions of hymns of which they hold the copyright. We miss from this collection the following highly esteemed productions: "A living stream as crystal clear," "As pants the hart for cooling streams;" those beautiful lines full of true poetic grandeur, beginning "Eternal Father strong to save," "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds," and "Sweet the moments rich in blessing," with several more.

As compensation for these omissions many new and beautiful hymns have been added. Mr. Thring, himself the composer of not a few of them, has been very happy in supplying hymns for special occasions, such as the opening of an organ (No. 279), a collection for a hospital (No. 559), Church Conferences (No. 581), Guild meeting (No. 583), Consecration of a burial-ground (No. 595), &c., for which hitherto it has not been easy to find suitable compositions.

The book is indebted to the Rev. H. W. Hutton, Prebendary and Priest-Vicar of Lincoln Cathedral, for one of its most striking characteristics. Not only has the Prebendary given his help and general supervision in every way to the work, but to his taste and judgment "the marks of expression added to the hymns are entirely due." The idea of introducing these marks of expressions in an edition of hymns without tunes is an innovation which will commend itself to all singers. Nothing is more painful than the monotonous bawling of some congregations, whose singing is devoid of all light and shade. If we mistake not this plan of inserting these expressions will to a great extent remedy this, and be hailed not as a "dangerous experiment," but as a material and useful help. The four indices, of authors, of texts, of metres, and of first lines, give great completeness to the work, which in justice to the author calls for high praise, though it cannot be said to be near perfection. Another edition will doubtless soon be issued; and many words, altered from the original text of the hymns incorporated in the present one, will be restored, we trust, upon Mr. Thring applying himself to the work of supervision.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I hope that you will help me to answer the opinions of "R. H. W.," as given in the *Guardian* of July 14th. He seems to me to take for granted what he is positively bound to prove. All persecutors, he says, are devoid of charity and toleration, and wholly in the wrong. All who oppose Mr. Bradlaugh are persecutors, and, therefore, are devoid of charity, &c. I know not whether any special persecution of Mr. Bradlaugh may have been carried on, but I deny that they who refuse to allow him quietly to take his seat in the House of Commons, and who are appealing to our courts of law against him, are persecutors. Surely, whatever may have been the position which it became us to assume towards him before he was elected an M.P., the case was wholly altered when he became the aggressor; when, being returned to Parliament, he publicly avowed opinions which the mass of Englishmen believe to be atheistical, and claimed, while holding

such opinions, to act as one of our legislators. Surely, neither charity nor tolerance require us to welcome as a legislator a man whose opinions we believe to be subversive of all religion and morality, and whose admission is rendered possible only by a special alteration of our laws or customs. To persecute him would be wrong; to tolerate him may be a duty. To allow him perfect equality in all respects with all other citizens is very wrong. And it is only by a thorough confusion of terms that the refusal of such equality can be called persecution. I am quite astonished at your correspondent venturing on his allusion to Gamaliel. If his illustration is worth anything, it bears to be carried out thus: It was wrong to oppose St. Peter and St. John because, perchance, their counsel and work was of God; therefore, we must beware how we oppose Mr. Bradlaugh, lest, perchance, his work be of God. I prefer to leave this argument untouched.

Nor is his reference to the case of the Israelites much happier. Here your correspondent's argument would seem to be, because they who in old time persecuted God's chosen people were wrong, therefore we are to welcome as one of our legislators a man who denies the existence of the God who chose Israel as His own people. Amazing argument!

And we are to do these things in the name of charity. We are to look on quietly while this solemn change is made in the character of our Parliament, although we pray continually that all their consultations may be directed to the advancement of God's glory. And those of us who refuse so to act are told that we have no charity. I say, may such charity perish. It certainly is not, as far as I can judge, the charity which influenced St. Peter when he spoke as he did to Ananias and Simon Magus; or St. Paul, when he addressed Elymas; or St. John, when he wrote his Second Epistle. I should have supposed that the charity, or love, which "R. H. W." seems so highly to admire, had its root in love of God, and that to give the right hand of fellowship to one who denies His existence, to welcome as one of our legislators a man who must deny that we owe any of our national greatness to the one living and true God, was a somewhat remarkable way of showing our love to Him.

Most firmly do I trust that if our courts of law decide that Mr. Bradlaugh is not qualified to take his seat in the House of Commons, and our whole Legislature should be asked to alter our laws in order to admit such men to Parliament, we may all, through the undeserved goodness of God, be saved from what I believe would be a grievous national sin.

Cheltenham, July 16, 1880. FREDK. POYNDER.

———:o:———

The choral festival season has begun. Last week there were two. At Lichfield Cathedral, on Tuesday, there were 550 voices; and the service was under the auspices of the Diocesan Gregorian Association. Dean Bickersteth, who preached from Psalm xxix. 2, in concluding his discourse said:—"It is not, perhaps, sufficiently remembered that there is a great difference in the rhythm of languages; and hence, when our services came to be compiled in English, it seems to have been felt that the pre-Reformation music, which was beautifully adapted to the Latin, did not fit in quite so well with the English. The Ambrosian and Gregorian tones, and the whole class of music connected with them, formed, and still form, an admirable rendering of Latin words. It may be questioned whether they lend themselves quite so readily to the English."—A still more considerable gathering was held on the following day at Durham. On this occasion sixty choirs were represented by 426 boys, 312 first trebles, 214 altos, 237 tenors, and 262 basses—total 1,451, of whom 651 were surpliced. The music in this instance was Anglican, and the sermon was preached by Canon Chester, vicar of St. Hilda's, South Shields, from Psalm xcvi. 8, 9.—On Thursday there was a choral festival at Portland, but, owing to want of accommodation, the services were held simultaneously at St. Peter's, near the Prison, and at the Avelanche Memorial Church. At the former there were 148 surpliced and 100 unsurpliced choristers; at the latter the numbers were sixty-nine and eighty. At St. Peter's the organ was supplemented by the band of the 56th Regiment. The sermon was preached by Canon Baynes, late vicar of Coventry.

The following memorial was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury on Friday last by the Archdeacon of Middlesex, who was commissioned by his Grace to "assure the 127 memorialists that he will give his best attention to a memorial upon a subject so important both in itself and from the names which are attached to the document:"—"We, the undersigned clergy of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex, possessing the right of voting for Proctors in the Convocation of Canterbury, hereby respectfully approach your Grace, with our most earnest request that you will apply to the Crown for Letters of Business to the Convocation of your province, directing it to prepare and submit for the approbation of the Crown a canon for enlarging and improving the representation of the clergy in Convocation; or will take such other steps as your Grace may see fit for carrying out these objects: 1. By increasing the number of elected Proctors; and 2. By establishing an uniform system of free and direct elections by archdeaconries."

On Saturday Mrs. Fraser laid the foundation-stone of St. Clement's, Greenheys, Manchester; after which a short address was given by her husband, the Bishop. In acknowledging a compliment which was paid her at the close of the proceedings, the right rev. prelate said:—"When I asked her to share my fortunes, I told her that if she came here the Lancashire people would find her something to do. That did not make her afraid, and she has come here prepared to do anything reasonable that she has the strength and ability to do. Her heart is in every good work, and I will let you into a little secret—you have no idea what a comfort and a help I find her." The new church will consist of a chancel, nave, and north and south aisles, and will supply accommodation for 750 worshippers. Mr. R. H. Price, of Manchester, is the architect, and the designs, which were selected after competition, are in the Early English Gothic style. The total cost, inclusive of a parsonage-house, will be about £6,000, without reckoning the amount paid for the land.

The *Exeter Gazette* says:—We have much pleasure in stating that the unpleasantness which has lately arisen between the Dean and Chapter of Exeter Cathedral has been amicably arranged. The Dean has withdrawn the letter which unintentionally gave offence to the Chapter, and Chancellor Harington, though he has long contemplated retirement, has for the present withdrawn his resignation unreservedly. Churchmen throughout the diocese will be gratified to hear that the disagreement has been thus disposed of, and that while Dr. Boyd has evinced an honourable readiness to remove all cause of offence, the Chancellor has decided that his severance from the chapter shall not be attended with circumstances of so disagreeable a character.

The Origin of Convocation.—Convocation, which, after having been silenced for nearly a century and a half, has begun of late years to make its voice heard again, is now constituted nearly as it was in 1283. It is now a revival and an heirloom of the olden time, a striking instance of political resuscitation. It was then a novel mode of raising taxes from the clergy without the interference of the Pope. The clergy, secular and regular, though many of them were then, as now, very poor, had vast possessions in England, and refused to be taxed by lay authority. Many plans were tried by the kings to obtain grants of money from this rich and powerful body. At last the king bethought himself of summoning an assembly of the clergy by his own authority. From very early ages of the Church bishops had held synods to consult on the affairs of the diocese. Afterwards came provincial synods, called together by the archbishops. The clergy of all England were represented in the national synod. When the Wittena-gemote, the assembly of wise men, of the Anglo-Saxons met, with them assembled also a Church-gemote. Edward I. summoned the synod when he summoned his Parliament. The king's writ required clerks to be elected to serve as proctors. The clergy were unwilling to appear, and denied the right of the king to call a synod. Though bishops and mitred abbots sat in the House of Lords as peers holding baronies, and other abbots and priors of lesser rank were summoned to Parliament, they went because they held lay fiefs.—*Rock*.

Bishop Piers Claughton, in consecrating an addition to the cemetery at Braintree on Saturday, for his brother, the Bishop of St. Albans, took the opportunity of referring to the feeling caused by the Burials Bill now in Parliament. Their minds, he observed, need not be disturbed, as if their act of that day had less meaning or value, or as if that ground would not as surely be the quiet resting-place for the Christian dead till the day of the Resurrection.—The Bishop was afterwards entertained at luncheon by the burial board, and, responding to his health, he expressed great sympathy with the clergy, who, he reminded them, had the support of their own Diocesan. It was, he said, with the greatest respect for their feelings that he still ventured to remind them that the burial of Nonconformists could not be considered as anything but a Christian service, and this was all that the present bill contemplated. His remarks were very cordially received by all present, and though some had strong objection to the bill, they listened with satisfaction to the encouraging sentiments of their Episcopal guest, and imbibed something of the cheerfulness to which he evidently wished to lead them.

The Rev. Hieronymus Myriantheus, Hellenic chaplain in London, who was a short time ago elected Metropolitan of Cyprus (being a native of that island), has declined the honour.

The Rev. George Ross-Lewin, rector of Thorneyburn, Bellingham, Northumberland, and of Rosshill, Kildysart, has notified to his tenantry at Rosshill and Coolsipeen that in consequence of increased depression he will accept the May rents at a reduction of 25 per cent., besides cancelling off all arrears, which in a few cases amounted to some years' rent. This generous act on the part of Mr. Ross-Lewin, says the *Durham Advertiser*, is but one of the many kind acts displayed by the rev. gentleman towards his tenants for the past thirty years. His father, the late Major Ross-Lewin, was instrumental in saving from starvation in the famine years many of the poorer classes in the locality.

A gentleman who has already subscribed liberally to the St. Albans Cathedral Fund has promised another donation of £500 if three or four more will give a like sum, and after that a furthur sum of £500 on the same condition.

The President of the English Church Union has addressed a letter to the members of that society, asking them to write to their Parliamentary representatives to preserve the Lords' amendment to the Burials Bills.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arbuthnot, Rev. Robert Keith, vicar of St. James', Ratcliff.
Briggs, Rev. Francis William, vicar of St. Matthias', Bethnal-green.
Burden, Rev. Frederick Gouldsmith, Perpetual curate of Lee Brockhurst.
Burgess, Rev. William John, rector of Stretton Sugwas.
Davis, Rev. William Smith, rector of Steeple Gidding.
De Putron, Rev. Godfrey Pierre, rector of Telscombe and vicar of Piddinghoe.
De Soyres, Rev. John, chaplain, Cronstadt and St. Petersburg.
Drought, Rev. Walter John, chaplain, Chantilly.
Edmundson, Rev. George, vicar of Northolt.
Glover, Rev. Edward, vicar of Denham.
Goodacre, Rev. Alfred Randolph, minister of St. Mark's Church, Camberwell.
Golightly, Rev. Joseph, vicar of Shilbottle.
Gough, Rev. Edward J., vicar of Christ Church, Wolverhampton.
Grey, Hon. and Rev. J., rector of Houghton-le-Spring, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham; rural dean of Houghton-le-Spring.
Guise, Rev. J., vicar of Lea near Ross.
Hanbury, Rev. John Caple, rector of Little Bromley.
Heanley, Rev. Robert Marshall, rector of Wainfleet All Saints'.
Hillyard, Rev. Walter, perpetual curate of Worleston
Ivens, Rev. Colemam, vicar of Carnaby-with-Fraisthorpe.
Jelf, Rev. George E., vicar of Saffron Walden; Canon of Rochester. Patron, the Lord Chacellor.
Jenner, Rev. Stephen, vicar of Beaksborn.
Johnson, Rev. H. Frank, vicar of High Wych, Sawbridgeworth; Rector of Chelmsford.
Kinch, Rev. Arthur Edoe, vicar of Bozeat-cum-Strixton.
Latter, Rev. Authur Simon, vicar of North Mimms; Chaplain, Coblentz.
Long, Rev. Frederick Charles, vicar of Tibshelf.
Myers, Rev. Jerusalem Gedaliah, chaplain, Bengal.
Prosser, Rev. William, vicar of St. Luke's, Bilston.
Sanctuary, Rev. C., vicar of Christ Church, West Fordington, Dorchester. Patron, the vicar of East Fordington.
Sargent, Rev. Henry John, rector of East Wittering.
Scott, Rev. William Edward, rector of Hawthorn.
Seeley, Rev. Henry, perpetual curate of St. Philip the Evangelist, Camberwell.
Sharpin, Rev. William George, chaplain, Christ Chnrch, Pau, France.
Skene, Rev. George William Charles, rector of Barthomley.
Smith, Rev. Charles J. E., vicar of Bromham-with-Oakley.
Smith, Rev. Hely Hutchinson Augustus, vicar of Market Rasen.
Waterfield, Rev. Henry Brooke, vicar of St. Eval.
Yate, Rev. Charles Allix, honorary canon in Peterborough Cathedral.

—— : o : ——

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bockett, Rev. Joseph, M.A., rector of Stoodleigh, Devon, at Exeter, on July 16th, aged 85.
Cree, Rev. John R., at Ower Moigne, Dorset, rector of the parish, on July 14th, aged 74.
Ellis, Rev. E. W., LL.D., vicar of Foxton, Market Harboro,' and editor for many years of the *Churchman's Monthly Penny Magazine*, on July 14th, aged 63.
Middelton, Rev. Thomas, at West Stockwith, Notts, on July 7, aged 63.
Treffry, Rev. Edward John, D.C.L., of Place, at Fowey, on July 10, aged 71.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CANDLE OF THE LORD.

By the Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS,
Rector of Trinity Church, Boston, United States.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey, on the Anniversary of American Independence, July 4th, 1880.

"The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord."—Proverbs xxvii. 20.

THE essential connection between the life of God and the life of man is the great truth of the world, and that is the truth which Solomon sets forth in the striking words which I have chosen for my text. The picture that the words draw is one of the most simple. A candle stands on a table. It is unlighted. Fire is brought into the room from some burning hearth outside. It flares and quivers, and any moment may go out, but the vague, uncertain blaze touches the candle, and the candle catches fire, and its flame burns strong, and pure, and constant. The candle becomes a fire, a manifestation point for all the neighbourhood which is illuminated by it. The candle is lighted by the fire, and the fire manifested by the candle. They bear witness that they are made for one another by the way in which they incorporate each other's life. The inferior substance renders obedience to the superior, the wax catches the subtle flame which is its master, and yields to its power. A disobedient substance, if you try to burn it neither gives the fire a chance to show its brightness, nor gathers any splendour to itself; it only calls forth sullen resistance, and as the heat increases, it splits and breaks, but will not burn. But the candle does, and so in it the scattered fire finds a point of permanent and clear expression.

Can we not see such a picture in man? What must be meant when it is said one being is a candle to another being? Look how men take hold of men in a city: the thought, the feeling in the central man touches all who are in it to think and feel; the very boys catch something of his power and have something about them that would not be there if he were not in the town. What better description could be given, than to say that that man's life was a fire, and that all the others were candles which he lighted, and which gave to the rich warm life that was in him multiplied words and steady expression, so that he lighted the town through them. I pity you if in your home there is not some loving nature which is your fire. Such a fire burns clear, and wherever you are carried you carry this fire, and set it in some new place; nay, the fire itself may have disappeared, the nature may have vanished from the earth, and yet still your candle, which was lighted at it, keeps that fire still in the world, as the fire of the lightning burns in the tree that is struck long after the lightning itself has vanished. It is there, and is alight. So the man of the counting-room is a candle to the woman that sits at home, making her influences felt in the rough places of trade. So a man who lives like an inspiration in the city may be only the candle in whose obedient light burns still the fire of another strong, true man who was his father, and who passed out of men's sight a score of years ago. Men call the father dead; but he is no more dead than the torch has gone out which lighted the beacon that is burning still on the hill.

Now, in regard to this lighting of life from life there are two things to be noticed—the two which appeared in the story of the candle. There must be a corresponding of nature between the two, and, secondly, a cordial obedience of the less to the greater. The nature that cannot feel the other nature's warmth, even if held close to it, and which refuses to be held where the other nature's flame can reach it, that must go unlighted, no matter how hotly the fire of the higher life may burn. We need to turn to Solomon and read his words again. "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord.' God is the fire of this world. What thing of nature can picture to us the thought which has always lifted men's hearts when they have said the word God, like this strange thing, so heavenly, so terrible, and yet so gracious, so full of creativeness, and yet so quick to sweep whatever opposes it out of its path; the marvel, the beauty, the glory, the mystery of fire? Men have felt the fitness of the picture, and this fire has crowded closest of all the elements round the throne in which the Deity of their conception is seated. God is the fire; the spirit of man is the candle. If man is of a nature which corresponds to the nature of God, and so far as he is obedient to God, the life of God, which is spread throughout the universe, gathers itself into him, and men, ay and all other beings (if such beings there are capable of watching our humanity) see what God is in gazing at the man, God's candle. Here in such a man is the fire of divinity. Men feel it. That is the meaning of a great deal of the unexplained mysterious awfulness of life, of which they who are much in its power are only half aware. It is a sense of God, felt but unseen, like an atmosphere burdened with heat that does not burst out into fire. In the midst of this world there stands a man, pure, godlike, and perfectly obedient to God; in an instant it is as if a heated room has found some point where it could kindle to a blaze. A vague oppressiveness of God's presence becomes clear and definite, the impression of divinity steadied into permanence, and the mystery changes its character, and is a mystery of light, and not darkness. The fire of the Lord has found the candle

of the Lord, and burns clear and steady, and in a cheering instead of a bewildering and frightening way, as soon as a man has begun to catch and manifest His nature. I hope we shall find this truth comes close to our lives.

Before we come to that, I would remind you with what a dignity it enriches the life of man. The philosophy of our time would deprecate the importance of man in the world, and rob him of his centralness. Man's instinct and pride rebel against such philosophies, but he is puzzled by their speciousness. Is it true that this world is made for man, and from man, standing in its centre, all beside get their true value, and receive the verdict of their destiny? That was the old story the Bible told. Genesis, with its Eden and obedient beasts, waiting until the man should tell them what they should be called, struck firmly, at the beginning of the world's history, the great note of the centralness of man; and the garden of Eden, in this its first idea, repeats itself in every cabin of the Western forests or the Southern jungles, where a new Adam and a new Eve, a solitary settler and his wife, begin the human history anew. There the note of Genesis is struck, and man asserts his centralness; the forest waits to catch the colour of his human life; the beasts haste in fear away till he tames them; the earth under his feet holds its fertility at his command, and answers the summons of his grain or flower seeds. The very sky regards him, and what he does upon the earth is echoed in the changes of the climate and the haste or slowness of the storms. This is a great, impressive idea, which the simplest life of man is ever creating, and with which the philosophies which would make little of the separateness and centralness of the life of man must always have to fight. This is the impression taken up and made clear, and turned to a mighty dignity, when there comes such a message as this, "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." Solomon says the true separateness and centralness of man is in his likeness by nature to God, and in that capacity of spiritual obedience to Him, in virtue of which man may be a lively declaration and manifestation of God to all the world. So long as that truth stands, the centralness of man is sure. "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." That is the truth of which I wish to speak,—the perpetual revelation of God by and through Himself.

You must ask yourself first what God is. See how at the very bottom of His existence, as you conceive of it, there lie these two thoughts, purpose and righteousness; how impossible it is to give God any personality, except as the embodiment of these two qualities, the intelligence that plans, and the righteousness that lives in duty. How could any knowledge of these qualities of what they are, of what sort of being they will make, exist on the earth, if there were not a human nature here in which they could be uttered? Only a person can truly utter a person; only from character can character be caught. You might write up all over the skies that God was just, but it would not burn there; it would be a bit of knowledge only, never a Gospel, never something to gladden the hearts of men. That comes only when the human life is capable of justice like God's justice, made just by God, clothed with His justice in the eyes of men. "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." I have intimated one thing. We need to observe that man's utterance of God is an utterance of quality, it can tell me nothing of the *quantities* that make up His life. That God is just, and what it is to be just I can learn from the lives of just men about me; but *how* just He is, to what inconceivable perfection that majestic quality of justice may extend in Him, of that I can form no judgment that is worth anything from the justice I see in my fellow-men. This widens at once the range of the truth I am stating. I have the quality of God which man is capable of uttering; then I must have the simple quality of manhood that is necessary for the utterance—the quality of manhood, and not any specific quantity or assignable degree of manhood. Whoever has in him the human quality, the "spirit" of man, may be the candle of the Lord. A larger measure of that spirit may make a brighter light; but there must be a light wherever any human being, in virtue of his humanity, by obedience becomes luminous with God. These are the men of lofty spiritual genius, the leaders of the race. How they stand out in history, how all men feel their power, and feel in their presence that they are passing into the light of God! They are puzzled when they try to explain it. There is nothing more instructive and suggestive than the bewilderment men feel when they try to tell what inspiration is; how men become inspired by God. The lines they draw from the continual communication between God and man are always becoming unsteady and confused; but in general he who comes into the presence of any powerful spiritual nature feels as though in some way he is coming into the real presence of God. But it would be melancholy if only the great men could give you this conviction. The world would be darker than it is if any human spirit, as soon as it became obedient, did not become the Lord's candle. A poor, bruised life, if only it keeps that human quality, and does not become inhuman, and is obedient to God, in its blind way becomes a light. Lives yet more dark than it become aware of God through it. A mere child with his pure humanity and with his turning of his life towards God from whom he came, how often he may burn with some suggestion of divinity which can cast illumination upon problems and mysteries whose difficulties he himself has never felt! There are great lamps and little lamps, the world is bright with them. You see your book, and while you are standing in the light which it has shed around you, your child sees some simple, childlike thing beside you, and a new thread of shining wisdom runs through the sweet and subtle thought that the great

thinker gave you, as the light of a little taper sends its needle of brightness through the splendour of a sunlit world. The fire is the same, whatever be the human lamp that gives it its expression. There is no life so humble that if it be truly and genuinely obedient to God it cannot shed some of His light. There is no life so meagre that the greatest and wisest of you can afford to despise it. You cannot tell at all at what sudden moment it may flash forth with the fire of God.

In this truth of ours we have the key to another mystery. What shall we make of some men, rich in generous desires, well educated, and who, now their training is complete, stand in the midst of their fellow men completely helpless. There are plenty of such. We have all known them. Men expect light from them, and no light comes. They themselves are full of amazement at themselves. They build themselves for influence, but no one feels them. They kindle themselves to light, but no one shows a grateful answer back to them. Perhaps they blame their fellow men, perhaps they only wonder what is the matter, and wait, with a hope that never dies into despair, for the long-delayed recognition, At last they die, and the men who stand about their graves feel that the saddest thing about their death is that the world is not perceptibly the darker for their dying. What does it mean ? We let the light of Solomon play upon it. It is this. They are unlighted candles, the spirit of man elaborated, cultivated, finished to its very finest, but lacking the last touch of God, as dark as a row of silver lamps, all chased and wrought with wondrous skill, all filled with choicest oil, but all untouched with fire. They are all cultivated men, set up in order along the corridors of some age of history, round the halls of some wise university, or in the pulpit of some stately church, to whom there has come no fire of devotion, who stand in awe and reverence before no wisdom greater than their own, who are proud and selfish, and who have never known what it is to obey. There is an explanation of your wonder when you cling close to some bright man, some man whom the world calls bright, and find you get no brightness from him. There is an explanation of yourself, puzzled man, who never can make out why the world does not turn to you for help. The poor, blind world cannot tell its need nor analyse its instinct, or say why it seeks one man and not another, but through those blind eyes it knows where the fire of God has fallen upon a human life. This is the meaning of the strange helpfulness which comes into a man when he truly is converted. It is not new truth he knows, new wonders he can do, but it is that the unlighted nature in utter obedience and self-surrender in that great hour has been lifted up and lighted at the light of God, and burns within him. The worst thing in life is not to be powerless or uninfluential. There are men enough with respect to whom we would thank God even if they would do us harm. I will not stop to question whether there is such a thing as life without influence, or whether the men of whom I have just been speaking do not belong also to the class of which I want next to speak ; but you will recognise the fact that there are many men whose lamps are certainly not dark, and yet who are not the candles of the Lord. A nature furnished richly with the very prime of human knowledge, wit, skill, with the graces of the body, perfect and yet profane, impure, worldly, and scattering scepticism of all the good and true wherever he may go ; his is no unlighted candle, he burns so bright and lurid that often the pure light grows dim within his glare. But if it be possible for the human candle, when the subtle components of a human nature are all mingled carefully in it,—if it be possible that, instead of being lifted up to heaven and kindled at the pure beam of Him who is eternally and solely good, it should be plunged down into hell and lighted at the fellow-flames that burn out of the dreadful brimstone pit, then we can understand the sight of a man who is rich in every energy of manhood cursing the world with the exhibition of the devilish instead of the god-like in his life. When the power of pure love appears as a brutal lust ; when the holy ingenuity with which men may search the character of their fellow-man to do good is turned into the unholy skill with which the bad man studies his victim ; when the almost Divine magnetism which is given to a man in order that he may instil his faith and hope into some soul that trusts him is used to breathe doubt and despair through all the substance of a friend's soul ; when wit, which ought to make truth beautiful, is prostituted to the service of a lie ; when earnestness is degraded to be the slave of blasphemy ; in all these cases, which no man among us fails to know, you have simply the spirit of man kindled from *below*, and not from above ; the candle of the Lord burning with the fire of the Devil. Still it will burn. Still the inflammableness of humanity will show itself. There will be light and power, and men who want nothing but light and power will go running to it. It is wonderful how mere power or mere brightness, apart altogether from the work which the power is doing, and the story that the brightness has to tell, will win the confidence and admiration of men from whom we might have expected better things. A bright book or a bright play will draw the crowd, although its meaning may be detestable ; a clever man may make a host of men stand like charmed birds before him, while he draws their principles out of them, and leaves them moral idiots. A majority will rush to the poll and vote for a man they know is false and brutal, because they have learned to say he is strong. Yet while men do these wild and foolish things, they know the difference between the illumination of a human life that is kindled from below, and that which is lighted from above. They know the pure flame of the one and the lurid glare of the other, and however they may praise and follow wit and power, as if to be

witty and powerful were a thing sufficient in itself, they have always a secret respect and confidence which they will keep for that power and wit which is inspired by God and works for righteousness. There is still another way, more subtle and dangerous, in which the spirit of man may fail of its completest function. The lamp may be lighted, and the fire may be indeed the fire of God, and yet it may not be God alone who shines forth on the world. I can picture to myself a candle which should in some way mingle a peculiarity of its own substance with the light it sheds, giving to that light a hue which did not belong essentially to the fire at which it was lighted. We would see in it not merely the brightness of the fire, but also the colour of the lamp. So it is with the way in which many good men manifest God. They have kindled their lights at Him very abundantly, and so He can make them His point of expression, but they cannot get rid of themselves. They are always mixed with the God Whom they show, they show themselves as well as Him, as when a mirror mingles its shape with the reflection of the things reflected from it, and gives them a curious convexity, because it is itself convex. This is the secret of pious bigotry, holy prejudices, the candle putting its own colour into the flame. The violent man makes God seem violent. The feeble man makes God seem feeble. The speculative man makes God seem like a beautiful dream. The legal man makes God look like a hard and steel-like law. Here is where all the harsh and narrow part of sectarianism comes from —the narrowness of Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Episcopalian, or Quaker. He is a candle full of the fire of God, but is always giving the flame his own colour; and by the disposition which many men have to value the smallest part of their lives more than the greater, he makes less of the essential greatness of the flame than of the especial colour which he lends to it. It seems as if in saying this I threw some slight on that individual or separate element in every man's religion. On the contrary, I place the highest value on it. Every Christian must live a Christian life which is definitely his own. Every candle must have its own peculiar light, but the true individuality of faith is independent of these characteristics. It does not add something to the universal light, but brings out more strongly some feature of it which is especially its own. Secondly, it cares more about the essential light than about the peculiar way in which it spreads the light. Thirdly, it stands surrounded with every special utterance of the universal truth in recognition of the value which it finds in them. Let these characteristics be in any man's religion, and then the individuality of faith is an inestimable gain, then the different candles of the Lord burn in long rows down the great palace halls of the world, and altogether, each complementing each, they light the whole vast space with Him.

I have tried to depict some of the difficulties which beset the full exhibition of the great truth of Solomon, "the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." Man is selfish and disobedient, and the Lord's light will not burn in him. He is wilful and passionate, and kindles his light with unholy fire. He is narrow and bigoted, and makes the light of God shine with his own peculiar colour. All these are accidents. These are distortions of the true idea of man. How can we know that? Here is the perfect Man, Christ. Look at Jesus Christ. What a man He is, nobly, perfectly, absolutely, beautifully human! What hands, what feet, what an eye, what a heart! How genuine a man is He who walks through the clear atmosphere and in the bright light of the Gospels! I bring the men of my experience and of my imagination into the presence of Jesus, and behold how the wisest and best fall short of Him! My human consciousness assures me they fall also short of the best idea of what it is to be a man. Here is the spirit of man in its true perfection; and what then? Is he not also "the candle of the Lord?" "I am come a light into the world," said Jesus, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." So wrote the man of all men who knew Him best. And in Him where were the defects that we see in ourselves? Where for one moment is there selfishness? It seems to me a wondrous thing that the supremely rich human nature of Jesus never for an instant turned to self-indulgence, or was beguiled by that besetting danger of all human souls, to wish in the deepest sense just to enjoy Himself. How facinating that desire is, how it keeps many of the most abundant natures from being useful; just to handle over and over again their hidden treasures, and with a spiritual miserliness, to think their thought for the pure joy of thinking, and turn emotion into the soft atmosphere of a life of selfishness. There is not one instance of that in Jesus. All the vast richness of His human nature only meant for Him more power to utter God to man. Yet how pure His rich life was! It abhorred to burn with any fire not Divine; there was such abundant life, and such utter incapacity of any living but the holiest, an utter incapacity of being kindled by any torch save God's. Such fulness, with such purity, was never seen besides upon the earth. Yet we know that He is no monster, but only the type of what all men must be, although all men but Him as yet have failed to be it. Yet there was intense personality, without a moment's bigotry; a special life, a life that stands distinct among all the million lives of men, and yet a life that makes the universal God all the more universally manifest by its distinctiveness, appealing to all lives just in proportion to the intensity of the individuality that filled His nature. I think I need only bid you look at Him, and you must see what it is to which our feeble lights are struggling. There is the true spiritual Man who is the candle of the Lord, a light that lighteneth every man. It is distinctively a new idea of life, new to the standards of our

ordinary living, which this truth reveals. All our ordinary appeals to men to be up and doing, and to make themselves shining lights, all fade away and become insignificant before this higher message which comes in the words of Solomon and in the life of Jesus. What does the higher message say to you and me? You are a part of God, it says; you have no place in the world but in relation to Him; the full relationship to Him can only be realised by obedience. Be obedient to Him, and you shall shine by His light, not by yours. Then you cannot be dark, for He shall kindle you. Then you shall be as incapable of burning with false passion as you shall be quick to answer to the true.

The Devil may hold his torch to you as he did to Jesus in the desert, and your heart shall be as uninflammable as His. But as soon as God touches you, you shall burn with a light so truly your own, that you shall reverence your own mysterious life, and yet so truly His, that pride shall be impossible. What a philosophy of human life that is! "Oh, to be nothing, nothing!" cries the mystic in his revival-hymn, desiring to lose himself in God. "Oh, to be something, something!" remonstrates the unmystical man, ardent for personal life and character. Where is the meeting-point? How shall self-surrender meet that high self-value without which no man can justify his being, and honour himself in his humanity? Where can they meet, but in this principle—man must be something in order that he may be nothing. The something that he must be must consist in fitness to utter the Divine life, which is the only original power in the universe. And then man must be nothing, in order that he may be something. He must submit himself in obedience to God, so that God may use him in some way in which his special nature only could be used, to illuminate the world. Do not the two cries, which are the everlasting cries of earnest human nature, meet in that one aspiration of the Christian man, to find his life by losing it in God? To be himself by being not his own, but Christ's? In certain lands they prepare the candles with ceremonious care. The bees that distil the wax are sacred, and range in gardens planted with flowers for their use alone. The wax is gathered by consecrated hands, and the shaping of the candles is a holy task performed in holy places, with the singing of hymns, and in an atmosphere of prayer. All this is done because the candles, when they are made, are to burn in the most elevated ceremonies, and on the most sacred days. With what care must the man be made, whose spirit is to be the candle of the Almighty Lord. It is his spirit that the Lord is to kindle for Himself; therefore, the spirit must be the precious part of him. The body must be valued only for the protection and education that the spirit may gain by it. The power by which his spirit shall become a candle is obedience, therefore obedience must be the struggle and desire of his life; obedience, not hard and forced, but ready, loving, and spontaneous, the obedience of the child to the father, the obedience of the candle to the flame; the doing of duty not merely that the duty may be done, but that the soul in doing it may become capable of receiving Him; the bearing of pain not merely because the pain must be borne, but that the bearing of it may make the soul burn with the Divine fire that fits it in the furnace for the repentance of sin; and the acceptance of forgiveness, not merely that the soul may be saved from the fire of hell, but that it may be touched with the fire of heaven, and shine with the love of God as the stars for ever. Above all the pictures of what life means, and what may be made out of it, there stands this picture of a human spirit burning with the light of God, and showing it to every man. Oh, young friends, the old men will tell you that the lower pictures of life and its purposes turn out to be cheats and mistakes as they grow older. But this picture can never cheat the soul. The man whose life is a struggle after simple obedience to God, when at last his earthly task is done, may look from the borders of this life into the other, and humbly say, as his whole history of the life that is finished, and the whole prayer for the life that is yet to come, the words that Jesus said with His cross before Him, "I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do. And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." (St. John xvii. 4, 5.)

My friends, may I ask you to linger yet a moment longer while I say a few words I cannot help saying, words which shall not be unsuited to what I have been saying, and which shall for just a moment recall to you again, as it was so earnestly and eloquently recalled this afternoon, the sacredness which this day, the 4th of July, has always in the hearts of us Americans? If I dare, generously permitted as I am, to stand in this venerable Abbey, so full of our history as well as yours, and dare to claim that our festival shall have some sacredness to you as well as to us, my claim rests upon the simple truth that to all true men the birthday of a nation must for ever be a sacred thing. For in our modern thought the nation is the making place of men. Not by the traditions of its history, not by the splendour of its achievements, or the abstract excellency of its constitution, but solely by its present fitness to make men, to beget and educate human character, to contribute to the complete humanity, to the perfect man that is to be. By this, and by this alone, each nation in the group of nations must be judged to-day. The nations are the golden candlesticks that hold the candles of the Lord. No candlestick can be so rich or venerable that man shall honour it if it holds up no candle. In such days any nation out of the midst of which God has ever led another nation, as He did our nation, must surely watch with anxiety and prayer the peculiar development of our common humanity of which that new nation is made the home, of the special burning of the human candle in that new

candlestick, and if she sees a hope and promise that God does really mean to build in that new land some strong, and free, and new, and characteristic type of humanity, which shall help the world to its completeness, the mother land will surely lose, gladly lose, the thought and memory of whatever anguish accompanied the birth, for gratitude for the gain which humanity has made, "for joy that a man is born into the world." It is not for me to glorify to-night the country which I love with all my heart and soul. I will not ask your praise for anything admirable which the United States have been, or done, in this last century of their independant history. But on my country's birthday I may do here, in Westminster Abbey, something far more solemn, and far more worthy of the hour. I may invoke your sympathy, I may beg your prayers to God, that on the manifold wondrous blessings which God is giving her, on her freedom, for she is free to-day since the old stain of slavery has been washed out from her in blood, on her unconstrained religious life, on her passion for education and her earnest search for truth, on her jealous care for the poor man's rights, on her countless quiet homes where the future generations of her men are growing up, on her manufactures and commerce, her wide gates open to the east and west, on her strange meetings of the races, out of which a new race is slowly being born, on her vast enterprise and her illimitable hopefulness, on all the materials and machineries of manhood that are in her, on all that the life of my country must mean for humanity, I may ask you to pray that the blessing of God, the Father of men, and Christ, the Son of Man, may rest abundantly and for ever. Because you are Englishmen and I am an American; also because here, under this high and hospitable roof, we are all more than Englishmen and more than Americans; because here we are all men, children of God, waiting for the full coming of our Father's kingdom—therefore I ask you for that prayer.

CONTINUOUS LIFE.

By the Rev. EDWARD THRING, M.A,
Head Master of Uppingham School.

Sermon Preached in the School Chapel, on Sunday, July 4th, 1880.

"As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."—I Cor. xv. 22.

HERE we have the great law of death and life laid down sharply and distinctly. In Adam all die. The natural life of the natural man is death, but in Christ shall all be made alive; the natural life of the spirit is life indeed, life advancing, life unending. Or to put it in plainer words, sinful man goes on from bad to worse till corruption is the end; but the spiritual man goes on in increasing power of life, more and more cleansing out evil, more and more healthy and pure in heart, till life is made perfect in heaven. This is the great law of the redeemed; a progress out of the sickness and death of a lower nature, into the health, and strength, and life of a divine nature; a passing out of being the children of Adam into the being children of Christ. Now I would ask you to turn your thoughts on to the real meaning of those fearful words, "that in Adam all die." But first, never mind the mere fact that all of us will leave this world by what we call death. The sons of Christ do that. Yet Christ says, "whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die." However frightful we may think it, the leaving this world is not death; though without doubt the manner of it is meant to be a warning and teaching to us about death. True death, whatever else it may mean, means growth in evil, and growth in evil, and growth in evil; evil, active, spreading, poisoning, till the whole being is made perfect in evil, till good is cast out, and hatred of all that is pure and true put in its place. I say whatever else it may mean, for whilst sure that it means this, what unutterable misery may also be found in a world where all the surroundings are as accursed as the spirits that dwell there, none can guess, and none can tell. Yet human misery and human pain may well be to us stern teachers of what can be feared. And we children of Adam from the beginning of God's word to the end are met by the dread truth that in Adam all die. First let us look at the facts of our human nature. If we thought of them more, we should change our light ways of playing with devil's work. "In Adam all die," translated into more familiar words this means that evil perpetually is breeding its like, and that father hands on to son the curse of the cursed deeds he has done. I wish to press this home first; because the opposite truth of the conquering life of Christ cannot be understood or felt, till we feel a little what it means to inherit corruption, and what it means, therefore, to live and pass on life instead of corruption.

Let us first deal with the body only and its health. Everybody knows that gross self-indulgence, take drunkenness for instance, is but another name for disease and death; everybody knows that a drunkard's children are of bad constitutions, and inherit disease; that is, that in blood, and bone, and flesh, the evil done in old days still works, and poisons, and bites, snake-like and silently. There is another sin, that may not be named, and, I quote from the Medical Report of a great London district, which says, "there is evidence of a most reliable character to show that it causes more deaths, diseases, and deterioration of health, than all other preventable diseases put together." In other words, typhoid, and scarlet fever, and all illness caused by infection, and bad conditions of houses, and all other sanitary defects do not kill or smite with sickness so many as this one sin. This is part of the meaning of death working. This is the kind of meaning of the words "in Adam all die." Go in imagination into the Hospitals, stand by the beds of the sick and dying,

see their pain, their pale sad faces, their weary burden of helpless anguish, and know that in innumerable instances it is evil growth in evil, doing its work in the body that you see; evil, that has found out the evil-doer, or, sadder still, evil, long forgotten, of father or grandfather, still poisoning the life of younger generations. This is one form of death working. Many and many a sick bed is a crime taken later on at a riper stage; a crime, done boldly and gaily, but as truly the same on the bed of death, as it was in the chamber of its joy; the same crime, the secret evil, or open sin of sunny youth, of buoyant careless license, of better things deliberately put away, and nobler feelings stifled, the same crime, come back again in another hape, and hunting down its prey. Nay, it has never left him; the same crime that looked so gay once, let in to the palace of the soul, let in to the Temple of the Holy Ghost—the body—is ever after settled in the brood, gliding in the veins, a bitter poison of death, every day mastering more and more the life, till at length it flings its poor victim down, and in the silent hours of night the last flickering of life destroyed, even like the candle at the bed side, grows fainter and fainter as the morning dawns, and soon all is over, all the remorse and wasting of heart, all the blighted hopes, and broken purposes, buried in a shameful grave, an early grave, a grave dug by reckless hands in hours of seeming joy. All over, did I say? Nay, would God it were, the blood of hell that the dead man has fed dies not with him; even if he has no children of his blood to inherit the fatal legacy of wild passions, and shattered health, and powers impaired, there are children of his foul heart-thoughts and tempting words, and unclean actions, hearts that he has tainted and poisoned still moving on earth, infecting, tainting, poisoning still in their turn. With what care the wise isolate the fever cases, lest death have free range; with what pitiless severity the secret poisoner, fly where he may, is tracked by the ministers of justice to his last hiding place, and dragged out and hung. But what slight things are fever, or poisoner's crime, compared to the smooth face of him who is doing Devil's work on earth, who is infected with the virus of the Evil Spirit, who with a gay smile, and soft words, passes in and out amongst the crowd, letting the vipers he carries strike their venomed tooth wherever he gets an undefended soul, or a careless ignorant fool; and what viper ever bit like a tempter's poisoned word or look? No, the sad deathbed is not the end; the dishonoured grave does not bury the sin even on earth. Well did the Law send the leper outside the camp, as a dead man, as a living death; well did the Law punish with death sins that in England are lightly done—at least the beginnings of them. And Abraham's children to this hour alone survive out of the ancient world to bear witness to the power of life, and purity, and living obedience to law, inherited from their great father, and kept by them, whatever their other sins have been, better than by any other race on earth. "In Adam all die:" that is, evil unchecked goes on, a sad inheritance always destroying its victims in the end. Year by year, sin and temptation repeat themselves in different shapes; year by year, death and doom in different shapes seize on the evil-doers and their children. True, life is offered; life is freely given; the curse can at any moment be stopped; but this does not make it less true or less certain as a curse. How piteous it must seem to our Father in heaven to see the son repeating the father's temptations, betraying and betrayed; to see the same smiling beginning followed by the same ghastly end. For this He sent His Son to save. For this the Redeemer died on the Cross. The lost life, the dread sentence, "On the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," meant nothing less than this. Do you doubt it? Go see it written on wasted limb and faces that are as an unspoken curse, a silent doom in the streets, hear its cry of anguish from hospitals and deathbeds of poor and rich, from prisons, and palaces, and quiet homes alike. Know that it never stops. "In Adam all die," and those who choose to follow Adam in disobeying the Lord of Life carry within a judgment that never sleeps, that generation after generation does its deadly work, till it be worked out in utter destruction, or conquered by the life of Christ. This is the first great truth of the lost life, the truth that evil grows, and works doom year by year, and century by century, destroying all who love it; passed on as a foul inheritance from evil father to evil son. One of our divines* sums up the whole matter in these words: "Observe what misery there may be in any street, village, or knot of houses with which we are best acquainted, and, it is not the disasters which have entered into those houses, we shall find, but the devils that have entered into them that have undone them." Yes, brethren, it is devil-worship, and evil lightly sown but reaped in pain, the death that is in Adam chosen by Adam's sons that makes earth hideous, and never leaves its prey. This is the cause which brought the Son of God from heaven to give Life to a lost world.

* The late Rev. Professor Blunt.

The vicarage of Bradford, vacant by the acceptance by Bishop Ryan of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, has been offered by the trustees to the Rev. Joseph Bardesley, M.A., rector of Stepney, and Rural Dean. There are thirteen livings in the gift of the vicar of Bradford, and in other ways the post is one of great importance. Mr. Joseph Bardesley is well known as a vigorous and consistent upholder and defender of the principles of our Protestant Reformation, and as an experienced parish priest. With a due sense of the loss of his services in the East of London, especially at the present crisis of its history, we still venture to hope that the vast population of Bradford may be favoured with Mr. Bardesley's proved ability and experience.—*Record.*

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 31, 1880.

WE deem ourselves fortunate after our remarks last week to be able so soon to print a sermon on "Continuous Life," by so able, experienced, and orginal a preacher as the Rev. Edward Thring. It more than supplies the *desideratum* we then lamented in Modern and Christian Sermonology, and we strongly commend it to the careful consideration of our readers. It is eminently practical, and, like Holy Scripture, it clearly and truthfully describes the facts of our human nature, and rightly says "that if we thought of them more we should change our light ways of playing with Devil's work." From the analogy of "Continuous Life" in the body with its many disfigurements, disasters, and interruptions from sin, he enables us to realise the meaning of Everlasting Life and Eternal Death. What he states as to the survival of Abraham's children is very interesting, and fully borne out by vital statistics as well as by Scripture prophecies. A Jew's life is found on an average to be worth fifty-seven years in duration, whilst a Christian's in the same country is only worth twenty-seven, or less than half as much. Dr. Septimus Gibbon, speaking at the Pathological Society of London, in 1876, said: "The Hebrews of the Metropolis are notoriously exempt from scrofulous and tubercular taint. During the last twenty-five years I have attended a large number of Hebrews, both as hospital and private patients, and have never met with a single case of pulmonary consumption amongst them; and a former colleague at the London Hospital, who had a large *clientêle* amongst this favoured people, told me that for forty years he had only met with two cases. The Medical Officer of one of their large schools has remarked that their children do not die in anything like the ratio of Gentile children; and in the district of Whitechapel the Medical Officer of Health has reported that on the north side of the High-street, occupied by Jews, the average death-rate is 20 per 1,000 inhabitants, whilst on the south side, occupied by English and Irish, it is 43 per 1,000." (Trans. of the Pathological Society, vol. xxvii p. 437.) Dr. Gibbon attributes this superior vitality to the sanitary influences of circumcision. We believe that other nations who adopt this rite, as Turks and Zulus, experience a large immunity from *debility* and *disease*. If the benefits of this God-given rite are so vast, and add so much to the joyfulness of men, it is, we think, deserving of the attention of theologians whether they are justified in construing a temporary, or at least casual indulgence granted by the Apostles into an absolute and total repeal of an ordinance solemnly given by God Himself as an *everlasting* covenant. May not God, Who designed to save the body as well as the soul of man, have intended the covenant of Circumcision to save the body as that of Baptism was to save the soul? We shall feel obliged to any of our readers for a Sermon on Circumcision.

——:o:——

A RESPECTED correspondent, C. P. R., is no doubt perfectly right in excepting the *official* Turksf rom our remarks, as very few of them are really Turks, but Greeks, Armenians, and members of other nationalities. We had in view the landowners, merchants, and peasants, such as we saw them in Asia Minor, who are the backbone of the country as regards truthfulness, honesty, and morality. We do not admit that Mohammedanism is essentially *intolerant*. It is exclusive and very jealous of associating anything like idolatrous worship with its own; but in Turkey it freely allows every other religion to be practiced without let or hindrance. As to the non-admission of Christian evidence in Courts of Law, it arises not from intolerance, but from the exigencies of Mohammedan Law, which requires the truth of one witness to be confirmed by one, three, or five other witnesses, as the case may be. It is very essential, therefore, to have the *one* true witness as to facts, in order to save the confirming witnesses from perjury. It is notorious, and of every-day occurrence in the stree s, that no Eastern Christian ever asks the truth from a fellow-Christian who has witnessed a transaction, if he can obtain it from a Mahommedan.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DR. PUSEY AND CANON FARRAR.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir.—It is with a great sense of relief that I have read Dr. Pusey's book, which has just appeared, on *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment.* Of the four points on which I had dwelt as unauthorised "accretions" to the Catholic faith—namely, (1) material agonies of eternal punishment; (2) necessarily endless duration for all who incur it; (3) the opinion that it is thus incurred by the vast mass of mankind; and (4) that it is a doom passed irreversibly at the moment of death on all who die in a state of sin,—Dr.

Pusey concedes, as not being *de fide*, and as not representing his own opinions, the first, third, and (practically) the fourth.

1. As to the first point, he admits that the Church has never required a belief in physical agonies, and that "fathers of the highest esteem have held the immaterial character of the eternal punishment, and their sayings have not been comdemned."

3. As to the third, he agrees with Cardinal Newman, the late Father Faber, and the Rev. H. Oxenham, that the notion that the vast majority of mankind are doomed to endless torments "*has no solid foundation whatever.*"

4. As to the fourth, he considers that I am labouring under a misconception in supposing that the vast majority of mankind die "in a state of sin."

I might not arrive at the same conclusions as Dr. Pusey in the same way as he does, but on these three heads I find, with deep thankfulness, that I am so far in accord with him that I can accept, with scarcely even the smallest verbal modification, every one of the twelve theses in which he has summarised his faith as regards these three heads.

It is only as regards the second of my four points—the rejection of the view "that the duration of future punishment is *necessarily* endless for *all* who incur it"—that Dr. Pusey seriously impugns my opinion, and believes that I have not made good my point. On some of the arguments which he adduces I may feel it my duty hereafter (however reluctantly) to make a few remarks; but meanwhile I desire to say in the strongest possible manner, that if the majority of Christians held the conclusions of Dr. Pusey—as that, for instance, there is an intermediate state of purifying sufferings; that there is a possible change in the condition of the departed; and that there is "no solid foundation whatever" for the awful dread which so many have openly entertained that most of the myriads whom we daily meet are doomed to unending fire;—then I should never have been impelled—as I *was* impelled by a sense of deep and intolerable pain—to speak upon the subject. In point of fact, the differences between Dr. Pusey and me resolve themselves into very secondary questions:—for if he holds that most men do not die in a state of such sin as excludes them for ever from the presence of God, and also that some purification of imperfect souls is possible in the world to come, he holds all that I ask. All that I ever desired in this manner was the liberation of men's minds from fearful and fallible *inferences* as to the future, which I believed to be unwarranted by the voice of God, whether in Scripture or in the heart of man. I must again repeat, in answer to all the ignorant obloquy with which my views were misrepresented, that I never denied for one moment the existence of hell; and that I never denied even the possibility of its endless duration for souls obstinately hard and finally impenitent. The relief which I sought for the agonised hearts and consciences—not of sceptics, scoffers, and men of wilfully immoral life, but of some of the holiest and most loving of mankind—was found in the very simple view that Scripture nowhere enforces the belief that God's merciful dealings with the sinful soul of man are, necessarily and for all sinners alike, for ever terminated by the limit of physical death. That merciful hope—for even the title of my book has been misunderstood—I called "eternal," only because it was a hope which affected our views of the eternal world. If such a hope be not *at first sight* reconcilable with some passages of Holy Scripture, it certainly is in direct accordance with the natural meaning of others. My opinion may or may not be certain, but at any rate I must still maintain that it is perfectly permissible, and that it has never been authoritatively condemned. The simplest of many proofs that it has *not* been so condemned lies in the fact that it was held, not only by multitudes of good Christian men and women in the first three centuries, but by canonised Saints and Fathers of the Church of God.

Had my sermon—never meant for publication—produced no other good effect than that of calling forth so authoritative a statement on the points to which I have alluded, I should thankfully believe that it has been made an instrument for good. The subject of what Christians ought to hold as to the future condition of the soul is far too awful to be mixed up with mere personal criticisms; but perhaps I may be allowed to offer Dr. Pusey my earnest thanks for having written, even of what he conceives to be my errors—not in the tone of vituperation which others have thought fit to adopt—but with the courtesy and consideration of a great Christian teacher. If I should feel it to be my duty hereafter to close my share of the controversy by a brief and grave reply, there shall be in it no word otherwise than deeply respectful to one whose wide learning and saintly life command the veneration of all schools of thought among Christians, even those who most entirely differ from him in some of his views.

FREDERICK W. FARRAR.

17, Dean's-yard, Westminster, S.W., July 26, 1880.

—:o:—

THE TURKS.

SIR,—Your remarks about Turks will not please many people; but I quite understand them. One must always discriminate between different classes of them. The *official* Turks are utterly corrupt; private persons, especially peasants, are probably very different. Then, again, Mohammedanism is like Romanism, *essentially* intolerant, though not so far as Romanism. But no real believer in the Koran *can* put an unbeliever on a level with himself, in, say, a Court of Justice. This will effectually prevent the Mohammedan powers from entering *really* into our civilisation and international polity.

C. P. R.

—:o:—

SKETCHES OF EMINENT MINISTERS.

[THE VEN. C. P. REICHEL, D.D.]

The name of Dr. Reichel has been one of the most prominent in the Irish Episcopal Church for many years. He has been Professor of Latin in the Queen's University, chaplain to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Donellan Lecturer in the University of Dublin, and now is Professor of Ecclesiastical History in that University, and Archdeacon of Meath. Dr. Reichel belongs to what is called the Low Church section, and is a strenuous supporter of the views of that school, as opposed to the claims and pretensions of the High Church and Ritualistic parties. In 1855 he published a volume of discourses entitled "The Lord's Prayer and others Sermons" (Macmillan & Co.), now unhappily a scarce book. Readers of that extraordinary work, "The Unseen Universe," will remember that Dr. Reichel's volume is therein described as "a very remarkable work" (page 267). Not the least remarkable part of it is a sermon bearing the title "The Sin of Korah in the Church," founded on the words, "Seek ye

the priesthood also?" (Numbers xvi. 10). Dr. Reichel argues that for men to call themselves *priests*, or claim to be *priests*, is to commit the sin of Korah and his followers. At page 288 he says: "St. Paul declares Christ 'gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ;' hut *none*, you observe, *priests*. This is the function which Christ in the very nature of things reserves to Himself alone: the capacity in which He hath once for all offered the one all-sufficing sacrifice, and in which He now ever liveth making intercession for us; and Christian ministers have no more right to arrogate to themselves the functions of the Christian priesthood, than Korah and his Levites had to arrogate to themselves the functions of the Jewish priesthood. Here, then, the crime in the Christian Church corresponding to that which Korah and his followers committed in the Jewish Church flashes at once upon our minds. We see that it consists, not as is often stated, in the people taking to themselves the functions of the ministry, but in the Christian ministry impiously usurping the functions of Christ Himself; and, not contented with their Master's having separated them from the congregation of His people to bring them near unto Himself, to do the service of His house and to stand before the congregation to minister to them, *in their 'seeking the priesthood also.'* This is the gainsaying of Korah, which the authority of inspiration declares should be repeated, even in the earliest ages of the Christian Church; and which is significantly coupled by St. Jude with the way of Cain, and with the running greedily after the error of Balaam for reward." It is said that Dr. Reichel's opponents have never attempted to reply to his arguments and conclusions upon this subject. His explanation of the use of the word *priest* will interest many of our readers. He says:—

"The word Priest in the English tongue is derived from the Greek word Presbyter, which means an elder, and which is the only word used in the New Testament as the official title of the second order of the Christian Ministry (except, indeed, the word ἐπίσκοπος). This word Presbyter was in rapid utterance corrupted first into *Prester*, in which transition state it occurs frequently in the Norman-English of the Middle Ages, and from that, again, it was further shortened into *Priest*. Originally, therefore, the word *priest* meant the same thing only as the word presbyter, of which it is merely an abbreviated form. But when the Scriptures were translated into English, it was found that there was no word to express the Greek word ἱερεύς, which denotes a sacrificing priest, such as were Aaron and his sons under the Old, and such as is Christ alone under the New Covenant. Being, then, without a word to designate the Greak term for a sacrificing priest, they unfortunately allowed themselves to use for it that word which properly means only a presbyter or elder; so that the word Priest is now used in two completely different senses — the one that which is proper to it, and in which it denotes a presbyter or elder; and the other, that which is not proper to it, in which it denotes a sacrificing priest."

But it is not only a powerful opponent of High Churchism that Dr. Reichel is known in Ireland. He is equally famous as an opponent of infidelity; and, therefore, it was no small pleasure we saw it announced that, under the auspices of the Christian Evidence Society, he would preach at All Souls' Church, Langham Place, at four o'clock, Sunday, July 4th, on "The Impossibility of Accounting for the Origin of Christianity by Natural Causes," with special reference to M. Renan's theory. Not that we think M. Renan's theory worthy of such notice, but that we expected a treat from so able and experienced a controversialist and divine. Accordingly, to Langham Place we wended our way on that Sunday afternoon, and, as we expected a crowded congregation, went early and reached the church at about half-past three o'clock, to find the principal door shut and no appearance of public interest whatever. We waited until about a quarter to four, and still finding the door closed, asked a venerable female, who was standing near, the meaning of so strange a matter, and at once received the information that "the baptisms were then a-going on," but that we might get into the church by applying at a side door. To that door we went, and were suddenly confronted by a veritable beadle in all the glory of gold-laced garments and hat, who pointed us to another smaller door through which we passed and entered the church. Very courteously we were shown to a seat near to the pulpit, but as we passed up the aisle and looked round at empty pews—for there were not half-a-dozen persons present, beyond the few concerned in the baptismal service—we began to wonder what could be the meaning of it. There we sat, listening to the bells chiming out in a very lively manner and almost wholly drowning the voice of the clergyman officiating at the baptismal service, till four o'clock struck, when the chiming ceased, and the door was thrown open to admit about two hundred persons, mostly females, who formed the congregation. The church is large, and the presence of a handful of people under such circumstances was, to say the least, not encouraging to the Christian Evidence Society. Indeed we could not help thinking that the necessity for such a society in a land where Christianity is established by law, and where churches and ministers, preachers, Sunday school teachers, and other Christian workers, are to be numbered by tens of thousands, and in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, is a very curious and painful matter demanding most serious attention. Now, however, that there is such a Society, why is it not more extensively supported? Or was Dr. Reichel unpopular because he is an Irish clergyman and strongly opposed to High Church claims and pretensions? Or was it the subject itself that was unacceptable? Or was it the hour at which the service was held? We are afraid from what we have heard that the Christian Evidence Society has not been altogether wise in its arrangements in the past, and, therefore, has ceased to have much interest for the Churches.

The usual evening service was gone through, the lesson from the Old Testament being 2 Sam. xii., and, as verses 10 and 11 were read, we could not help wishing that the Christian Evidence Society would make it part of its work to employ ministers of ability and learning to explain such passages, for, to many persons, they must seem inconsistent with both the Divine character and the Divine law. We are convinced that a ministry thoroughly learned in the Scriptures would be the best Christian Evidence Society, and is that which is now needed most of all.

Dr. Reichel ascended the pulpit about half-past four o'clock, and his discourse, which he read, occupied more than an hour. He is now an old man, thin and shrunken, small in stature, with a fine head, almost quite bald, eyes that even yet flash fire, a mouth expressive of concentration and decision, drawn down at the corners like that of the late Lord Derby, and showing signs of irony and satire that might well make an opponent hesitate

to encounter him. His voice is clear and strong for his age, though a little harsh, and some of the tones have a very distinct ring of sharpness and severity. He took for his text the words of the Jewish Rabbi Gamaliel, as recorded in Acts v. 38, "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought," but made no further use of them. The discourse consisted first of a masterly exposition of M. Renan's theory of the life of Christ and the origin of Christianity, in which the brilliant Frenchman's perversions of history, fanciful interpolations, incapacity for critical research, and obscuration of moral consciousness, were handled with great keenness and ability; secondly, the difficulties and inconsistencies of the theory were examined; and thirdly, the sources were mentioned whence M. Renan obtained the material for his clever romance. Dr. Reichel seemed perfectly at home in dealing with these topics. Indeed, from the expression of his countenance and the tones of his voice it was easy to see that he thoroughly enjoyed the work he was engaged in.

Whether his hearers did so is another matter. When he had been nearly an hour at it we glanced round at the audience, and certainly, to judge from their looks, they had had quite enough of it. And as we were leaving the Church an elderly lady gave utterance to what we fear was by no means an exceptional impression—"As if that could edify any mortal!" We were sorry that the whole time was occupied with M. Renan's theory. We hoped and expeeted that the preacher would have dealt with the *positive* arguments in support of his subject, *the impossibility of accounting for the origin of Christianity by natural causes*, but nothing of the kind was attempted. This was a mistake, and we were not surprised at the remark of a gentlemen who sat in the pew with us, that "such sermons are more calculated to make people doubt than believe." We fear not a few of those present would go away with the impression of what M. Renan and others have said against the Christian records and Christian faith, and the impression would remain and work mischievously in their minds, because nothing had been put forward to afford food for reflection as to the positive evidence of the supernatural origin and character of Christianity. It may be said that this was not comprehended in the preacher's scope and purpose. Then we say it *ought* to have been comprehended—especially when the discourse was to be addressed to a promiscuous audience of a Sunday afternoon. From the chair which Dr. Reichel so worthily fills in his own University the discourse would have been in its proper place, though, even then, it is far from being a wise plan to show what infidel writers have said, or can say, and at the same time furnish no antidote to it. To prove that a particular writer like M. Renan is shallow and flippant does not prove that Christianity is a Divine religion, and yet this is the work which is by far the most important.

Moreover, he who would successfully deal with infidelity must come to the study of it with pity, as for a *disease* rather than a *crime*, and while he exposes its fallacies and follies should do so in the spirit of tender compassion and love. Without this we may indeed effectually refute our opponent's premisses and cover his conclusions with ridicule, but we cannot win souls to Christ. There are many ways to get ready for victory; but we conquer, as Christ upon the cross, by LOVE. As to M. Renan's theory of our Lord's life, and the origin of Christianity, no scholar attaches any importance to it. As Professor Christlieb has well said: "If one who was writing the history of Luther or Napoleon thus gave the reins to his fancy, we should expunge his name from the list of historians and place him among the *novelists;* and this we must do to Renan. A *novel*—this is the only true title of his book, with its constant mixture of truth and fiction, of historical fragments and subjective imagination. The effeminate, unhealthy, morbid tone of the modern French novel, with its utter want of moral consciousness, permeates the whole work." Dr. Reichel clearly and ably pointed out into what an abyss of gloom Renan's philosophy has led him—quoting his own words—and yet, such is the downward tendency of unbelief that our modern Agnostics, as they call themselves, treat with as much scorn and contempt Renan's poor and weak theistic faith, as he does orthodox Christianity. Meantime the Christian *knows* Whom he has believed, and has the witness in himself to the truth.—*The Christian Age.*

The Rev. Roland Errington, who on the resignation of Canon Carter was appointed Rector of Clewer by the Provost and Fellows of Eton College, was on Wednesday week formally admitted to the living by the Bishop of Oxford at a special service at the parish church. The Bishop, in an address to the congregation, commended the new vicar to their prayers, and said that he succeeded to a heritage of duty which was peculiar in its difficulty and responsibility. He mentioned in illustration the many works of benevolence and charity which had been carried on by the late rector during a period of five and twenty years, which were known far and wide, and made the parish famous in the land. To continue these works would involve a peculiar responsibility. Another difficulty, he said, arose from the disagreements which had prevailed in the parish. He counselled mutual forbearance and concession, and he charged the new vicar, as he had done in private conferences he had had with him, to be careful of their feelings, and even of their prejudices. He charged his people to be tender of his reputation, and to be anxious to do all they could to help him in the work to which he had set his hand, giving no occasion for disputings, and then he might, God willing, do good service in the saving of souls in that parish. He besought them to allow all differences to pass away, and to do all they could in the short life that was left to them to work together in Christian charity. Canon Carter had taken leave of his congregation on the previous Sunday.

The appointment by the Bishop of Worcester of the Rev. Richard Cattley to the Honorary Canonry in the Cathedral, vacated by the promotion of the Rev. G. D. Boyle to the Deanery of Salisbury, will give great satisfaction in this city and throughout the diocese. "Strangers have borne witness of his charity before the Church." Mr. Cattley's great and arduous services in connection with the restoration of the Cathedral, especially in regard to the clock and bells, which are mainly owed to his unparalleled exertions, well deserved some such recognition as they have now received. His activity and constant readiness to assist in every good and charitable work, diocesan, social, or religious, gives him additional title to the honourable preferment he has received. At the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities, and of the public at large, he has equally well deserved. His time, labour, and pains have been unrestrictedly bestowed for long years in the city's service.—*Worcester Chronicle.*

At the last monthly meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge a total of £850 in ten grants varying from £25 to £150 were recommended by the Standing Committee for Sunday-schools and Mission-rooms, subject to the following conditions:—The rooms, which are to be primarily Sunday-schools, must be freehold, and secured for Church of England purposes, and clauses to the following effect must be inserted in the trust-deeds of all such rooms:—"*(a)* Provided always, and it is hereby expressly declared, that the premises hereinbefore conveyed shall not, nor shall any portion thereof, at any time hereafter, be appropriated for or be used as a school board school, or as a National school, or as a public elementary school of any kind within the meaning of the 'Elementary Education Act of 1870,' or as a school for imparting secular instruction to children on week-days, during such hours as such instruction is now ordinarily imparted in National or board schools. *(b)* Provided also that the said premises shall be vested in trustees, one of whom shall always be the clergyman of the parish; and that with the clergyman of the parish shall rest, so far as is consistent with the general provisions of the deed, the selection of the purpose for which the premises may be used; and that the clergyman of the parish shall, subject to the above limitation, have the sole control and management of the said premises. *(c)* Provided further, that it shall not be lawful to let the said premises, or any portion thereof, for money, not without the consent of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge shall it be lawful to sell the same." And to the following resolution, passed by the monthly general meeting of the society in April, 1879:—"That no grant be made towards any building for a Sunday-school, or towards the rent of any premises for a Sunday-school, except on condition that the Church Catechism be a fundamental part of the instruction in the school." Nine other grants were made towards the rent of Sunday-school. The Standing Committee also reported that a grant of £500 made in April, 1876, for one year, for remunerating the teachers of classes for religious instruction to pupil-teachers at different centres, had lasted to the present time. Of this sum £250 had been put at the disposal of the London Diocesan Board of Religious Education, towards the salary from July, 1878, to Christmas, 1880, of an additional assistant-inspector, on the understanding that he should devote part of his time, in conjunction with the Rev. G. P. Ottey, to organising lectures and classes of pupil-teachers at various centres within the board's area of action. With the aid thus given by the society Mr. Ottey and his assistant, Mr. Bird, had given annual courses of eighteen lectures at four London centres, the average attendance at which had been from 400 to 500 pupil-teachers, including from fifty to sixty from board schools. The London Diocesan Board were anxious that Mr. Ottey and Mr. Bird should continue the work, and £250 were voted for the purpose.

The *Daily Telegraph* states that on Sunday St. James's, Hatcham, was highly decorated with flowers. The morning sermon, by the Rev. G. Jackson, of St. Thomas, Regent-street, was marked by a very defiant tone. The preacher said that those who opposed ritualism belonged to a "rotten, decaying, and lying heresy," and throughout used such strong language that a number of the parishioners went into the vestry to protest to the vicar. While this was going on one of the choir and another person struck a late sidesman. They were given into custody. Much excitement prevailed outside the church morning and evening.—Mr. Jackson himself, however, writes to us to say that he did not make use of the words ascribed to him. "I used no 'strong language' that I am conscious of, and my sermon was not 'defiant' of anything or anybody. It was simply a discourse upon the abstract proposition that the weapons of Christ's warfare are not carnal, but spiritual—such as, *e.g.*, faith, prayer, patience, love, and suffering."—At the Greenwich police-court on Monday, at the instance of the Rev. H. A. Walker, vicar, summonses were granted against Mr. Sanders, parishioner's churchwarden, for riotous conduct in church the day before; and a gentleman named Marton obtained summonses for assaults committed (he said) in the vestry.

The *City Press* states that in the case of St. Vedast, Foster-lane, the four churchwardens, Mr. Serjeant, Mr. R. Morley, Mr. Horwood, and Mr. Bengough, have determined to bring to the notice of the Court of Arches the conduct of the rector, the Rev. T. Pelham Dale, who has continued to perform the public services at the church in the same manner as before the decree of suspension. The case is fixed to be heard before Lord Penzance, at his room in the House of Lords, on Thursday, August 5th, at noon.

The earnest efforts of Dr. Bridge have, with the cordial co-operation of the precentor, the Rev. S. Flood Jones, resulted in the addition to the choir of Westminster Abbey of six assistant vicars choral, whose duty it is to attend every weekday afternoon. The choir at the daily Evensong is thus strengthened to an effective force of twelve men's voices, and the improvement in the rendering of the service is most noticeable.

—:o:—

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bridger, Rev. J., emigrants' chaplain, St. Nicholas' Church, Liverpool, S.P.G. organising secretary for Diocese of Liverpool.

Chester, Rev. T. H., vicar of South Shields, and hon. canon of Durham; rural dean of the Deanery of Jarrow-upon-Tyne.

Crawford, Rev. J. R., senior curate of St. Margaret's, King's Lynn.

Earée, Rev. Robert Brisco, curate of Walter Belchamp, Sudbury, Suffolk; British chaplain at Berlin.

Hamley, Rev. J., curate of Burford (first portion), Tenbury, Salop.

Harman, Rev. Edward, vicar of Edenhall, Cumberland; rector of Pickwell, near Oakham.

Kelly, Rev. Charles Napier, minor canon of St. Paul's, Cathedral.

Ridgeway, Rev. Charles J., rector of Buckhurst-hill, senior incumbent of St. Paul's, Edinburgh.

Thompson, Rev. Reginald Ward, assistant-chaplain of the Savoy.

—:o:—

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Banister, Rev. Edward, at the Vicarage, Besthorpe, Norfolk, twenty-one years vicar of the parish, on the 14th inst., aged 61.

Barrow, Rev. George Martin, B.A., at Writtle, Essex, (formerly scholar of Trinity College, Camb.), on the 25th inst., aged 65.

Bergne, Rev. Samuel Brodrib, at Church-road, Streatham-hill, for many years one of the secretaries of the British and Foreign Bible Society, on the 19th inst., aged 74.

Twigg, Rev. Robert, for thirty-eight years vicar of Tilmanstone, fifth son of the late Rev. Thomas Twigg, vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman-street, London, on the 22nd inst., aged 77.

Wilder, Rev. McMahon Charles Gosselyn, at Tyrol-villa, Cheltenham, rector of Great Bradley, Suffolk, eldest son of the rector of Brandeston, Norfolk, on the 20th inst., aged 38.

Woodyeare, Rev. John Fountain Woodyeare, at Crookhill, near Doncaster, on the 25th inst., aged 71.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE MOTIVE POWER OF CHRIST'S LOVE.

BY THE
VERY REV. DANIEL BAGOT, D.D.,
LATE DEAN OF DROMORE AND VICAR-GENERAL OF NEWRY AND MORNE, &c.

"For whether we be beside ourselves, it is to God: or whether we be sober, it is for your cause. For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if One died for all then were all dead; and that He died for all that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again."—2 COR. v. 13—15.

ONE important reason why St. Paul wrote the Epistle which contains our text was evidently this—to defend his principles and to vindicate his conduct against the malicious and unmerited aspersions of false teachers, who endeavoured to undermine his influence and to ruin his reputation. As it was the case with Christ Himself, so has it ever been with His faithful and devoted servants: "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household." Not satisfied with uttering contemptuous remarks upon his personal appearance and his style of speech (2 Cor. x. 10), these false teachers accused the Apostle of unsteadiness, of imperiousness, of tyrannically exercising his ecclesiastical authority, and even called him a fool and pronounced him to be mad. Thus do we often see the enthusiastic and earnest zeal that springs from the legitimate working of Christian principle pronounced to be insanity by those who cannot understand or appreciate, because they neither feel nor experience, its influence or its efficacy. But all such imputations are unfounded and unjust, as undoubtedly they were in the case of Paul, who might have replied to his accusers with the same emphatic tone of honest and triumphant confidence which he displayed in his answer to Festus in the presence of King Agrippa: "I am not mad, most noble Festus; but speak forth the words of truth and soberness." Let us notice, however, the difference which there is in his reply when writing to a Christian Church, as compared with the manner in which he speaks before a Heathen Governor and King. In the latter case he utters a simple but respectful denial, and does not enter into any explanations which they could not comprehend. Here, however, he explains the originating cause of his enthusiasm; he discloses the hidden source of that energetic zeal which lived as a sacred flame within his soul; and passing over the assertion that he was mad as scarcely worth a refutation, he accounts for the spiritual activity by which his conduct was characterized by tracing it back to its proper and peculiar origin—"whether we be beside ourselves, it is to God; or whether we be sober, it is for your cause"—as if he had said "Whether, as my accusers allege, I am under the influence of that excitement which is an ebullition of insanity, or whether I am acting in compliance with the calm dictates of a sober judgment, my object is to promote the glory of God, and your spiritual welfare, impelled by a strong and irresistible feeling. For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge that if One died for all, then were all dead; and that He died for all that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again."

In order to unfold and explain this important passage, I shall consider—

1. The leading facts of Christian truth which are here stated; and

2. The moral influence which a contemplation of these facts should exert.

I. Let us consider the leading facts of Christian truth which are mentioned in the text. These are *Two*—(1.) One died for all, and (2.) All were dead. And here I would first remark that the religion of the Gospel has this pre-eminent advantage, that it is not a system of merely speculative suppositions or theoretical opinions, but that it is a religion of *doctrines* based upon and emanating from *facts*. Its grand primary and central fact is, that Christ died for all. By this statement we are referred back to that stupendous expression of philanthropy which was exhibited to the view of an astonished universe when He who was at the same time the Man of Sorrows and the Son of God Incarnate, shed His blood upon the Cross for us men and for our redemption. For Christ did not die merely to leave us an example of submitting to the last efforts of persecution with calm and patient resignation; nor merely as a Martyr to prove by His dying testimony the truth of the doctrines He had proclaimed; but chiefly in order to present unto God and His Father a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, satisfaction, and oblation for the sins of the whole world. It is a principle, confirmed by the infallible testimony of God Himself, that without shedding of blood there can be no remission of sin. The requirements of the Divine Law—the attributes of God—the vindication of His justice, of His holiness, and of His truth—the necessity of asserting the dignity of His moral government and the inflexibility of the principles on which that government is based, rendered an atonement necessary: to magnify the Law, to demonstrate the perfection and consistency of the Divine attributes, and to constitute an honourable basis on which God, blending into one His judicial and paternal character, might take His stand, and while He was just to the demands of His own character and Law, might be, at the same time, the Justifier of the ungodly. It is in this that the Sovereignty of God, under the influence of His love, is manifested and exercised; not in dispensing with satisfaction, which we thus believe to have

been indispensable, but in accepting a substitutional or vicarious satisfaction, such as His infinite wisdom devised in order to meet the requirements of His moral government on the one hand, and the exigencies of man as a sinner upon the other. Accordingly "One died for all." Not "*One*" Who was only a man; not "*One*" Who was merely an angel or an archangel selected from amongst the ranks of those Cherubim and Seraphim who stand within the sunshine of the Eternal Throne, and to God "continually do cry;" but *One* Who was both God and Man, in Whom "dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," the very incarnation of infinite mercy in a human form, Who assumed our nature that He might become capable of enduring in the very nature that sinned those sufferings unto death which constitute what we may term the material of His Atonement, and Who as God imparted an infinite and imperishable efficacy to the sin-obliterating value of His sacrifice. Hence it is written that "Christ died for our sins;" that "He gave His life a ransom for many;" He, *Emmanuel*, God and man, as Priest, offered His humanity, consisting of both soul and body, as the victim, upon the altar of His Godhead, which Godhead gave infinite preciousness to His sacrifice, for it is the Altar that sanctifieth the gift. And in the great event of Christ thus dying for us, we have a practical evidence of a love, the length and breadth and depth and height of which no finite imagination can ever analyze or comprehend; all that we can say, when we contemplate the dying and the undying love of Christ our great Redeemer, is this: "Thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift."

II. The other important fact of Christian truth which is mentioned in the text is this—"then were all dead," or, as it should rather be rendered—"then these all died." This statement has been explained in two distinct ways. Some consider it as meaning that when Christ died, as a necessary consequence all men died, inasmuch as He was the representative of all, so that His dying was virtually the same as if they died, and therefore all are "dead with Christ," and "crucified with Christ," and consequently have a beneficial interest in the saving results of his death. No doubt this is a great truth inasmuch as the sacrifice of Christ was vicarious, and as He suffered "the just for the unjust that He might bring us to God." Others, regarding the *dying* of all, which is mentioned in the fourteenth verse, as corresponding analagously to the *living* mentioned in the fifteenth verse, attach to this statement a moral and spiritual meaning, and render the passage thus—"If One died for all then these all died so as to become dead in trespasses and sins, and therefore in need of the interposition of Christ to quicken them and to raise them up into a state of Spiritual life, in which they should live, not unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again. In this view of the passage let us notice how the two statements are connected—"If One died for all then these all died." The word "then" is not to be understood here as a particle denoting time, but as a particle of logical inference. Let us then observe how the apostle does not say—"If all were dead, then One died for all." He does not infer the fact and the necessity of a remedy from the prevalency and intensity of the disease, but He argues for the greatness of the malady from the costliness of the remedy—he infers or deduces the universality of the guilt from the universality of the Atonement. We may also observe how this statement implies that Christ did not shed his blood without an adequate reason, for "if One died for all then these all were dead." This latter statement, however, does not express the *cause* but the *occasion* of His dying. The state of death in which all men were sunk was the *occasion*, but the love of the Father and of the Son was the originating *cause* of Christ's death—"God commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners Christ died for us."

But let us attend to the argument which the text, under this latter view of it, contains for the universality of the Atonement: "Christ died for all." This is stated twice. Now, who are the "all" for whom He died? Is it "they which live?" Certainly not, but it was for all that were dead that he died. And who are they? All men without one single exception. The extent of the atonement is commensurate with the extent of the guilt. To limit the extent of the atonement would be to limit the extent of the guilt. To deny universal atonement would be equivalent to a denial of universal guilt. But the question is often asked—"if Christ died for all why do not all receive and enjoy the beneficial results of his death?" The answer is easy, it is—because, though all are *redeemed*, all are not *saved*. There is a vast difference between *Redemption* and *Salvation*; and the fundamental error of the Modern Calvintst consists in confounding these two. *Redemption* is what Christ effected once for all men when He gave His life as a ransom to buy them back from the consequences of sin, so far as to restore to them the life which they lost in Adam, for there shall be "a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust." (Acts xxiv, 15.) *Salvation* is the personal application in detail of the efficacy of that work to each individual sinner when he believes; so that the life which he receives through Christ, should issue in blessedness and glory throughout eternity. Redemption is by the death of Christ irrespective altogether of faith. Man is redeemed whether he believes it or not. Salvation is by faith in His death, for he that believeth shall be saved, and the faith which gives to the sinner an interest in the redeeming work of Christ, purifies the heart, worketh by love, and produces in the believer that holiness which is essential to happiness, for there can be no happiness without holiness. Thus Christ died for all, not that all should be saved, for there is a difference between the shedding and the sprinkling of the blood. It has been shed for all in order to redeem,

it is sprinkled by grace through faith in order to save. Thus although God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, yet Paul says, "We pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." In fact two leading and fundamental doctrines of the Gospel are—*universal Redemption* and *limited Salvation.* Both are contained in the sixteenth verse of the third chapter of St. John's Gospel—the former in the clause—"God so loved the world that he gave His only begotten Son," that is to redeem the world; the latter in the clause, "that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life," or should be saved. And both of these doctrines are contained in the text, for the Apostle says, "One died for all," and then he adds, not that all for whom Christ died should live, but, "that they which live," that is, that they who "live the life which they now live in the flesh by faith in the Son of God," "should not henceforth live unto themselves but unto Him which died for them (for them, as He died for all) and rose again."

2. We must now consider the moral influence which a contemplation of these leading facts of Christianity inspires. And here we should carefully attend to the manner in which the truths of the Gospel affect the mind, so as to preclude the idea of the believer acting under the impulse of fanaticism or of merely excited feeling. "The love of Christ constraineth us *because we thus judge* that if One died for all then were all dead, and that He died for all that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves but unto Him which died for them and rose again." Now observe the process and the progress here: the great truths of the Gospel are first of all believed as so many facts; when believed the judgment digests them and reasons upon them; then this exercise of the judgment stimulates the affections, more especially those of gratitude and love, which then exert an irresistible influence which is practically and visibly developed and displayed in the life and conversation of the believer. In short, all the faculties of the mind and all the affections of the heart are engaged, each in its own proper order and department. The feelings are not first excited. The affections do not sway the judgment, but the judgment controls and regulates the affections. Faith comes before feeling, and not feeling before faith. Thus our love to Christ, produced by a believing contemplation of Christ's love to us, is a solid, rational, and well-grounded emotion, the result of a deliberate and reasonable conviction: in short it is not a human passion, but a divinely inspired principle. The love of Christ to the sinner when felt and appreciated creates in him a corresponding love to Christ, as the Apostle John says: "We love Him because He first loved us." And this love, like that of Christ of which it is the reflection, should ever be pure and practical and self-denying. It should live within the soul of the believer as a steady and a sacred flame, predominating over all inferior and conflicting attachments, and working in him as the motive principle of a willing and cheerful obedience—an obedience which does not consist in a merely formal and mechanical compliance with the outwardly expressed commandments of a written Law, but in a ready and instinctive submission to the influence of an internal principle—the principle of love, for "love," says the Apostle, "is the fulfilling of the Law." And how irresistibly potent and persuasive is that influence! "The love of Christ constraineth us," or, as the original word may signify, compresses and gathers into one all our faculties and feelings, so as to concentrate and combine them for the production of an earnest ambition for the attainment of one grand and commanding object. The love of Christ with an impulsive euthusiasm carries away the believer into a cheerful and submissive consecration of all his mental and physical powers to the service of Him, who loved him and gave Himself for his redemption, not as the hurricane carries away with it the unconscious and unconsenting vessel, but as the valour of the soldier carries him away into the blazing battle and the scorching fight, or as the philosopher, the poet, or the philanthropist are carried away in the prosecution of their respective pursuits by an indomitable ardour which they would not, even if they could, resist. So the Christian is willingly and joyfully impelled to yield, with all his heart and mind and soul, to the energetic force of that love which constrains him to live not unto himself but unto Him which died for him and rose again.

To "live," says the Apostle, "not unto themselves but unto Him which died for them and rose again." Here we have a concise description of the external and visible effect of the power of that inward and invisible principle of which we have been speaking — our love to Christ produced by Christ's love to us. Here also we see how the spiritual education of the believer branches out into two distinct but consistent directions: he has not only to learn but to unlearn; he has to live not unto himself but unto Him which died for him and rose again. And yet these two synchronize and coincide like the convex and the concave of one and the same circular line. The believer under the constraining influence of the love of Christ must take up his cross and deny himself, endeavouring to carry out into practice that most difficult branch of Christian ethics which consists in restraining the sinful tendencies of a corrupt and fallen nature, in renouncing his own will, in combating against and conquering his prejudices, and in resisting those selfish inclinations to which he naturally clings with a tenacity which nothing but the Spirit of God, through the application of the love of Christ, can neutralize or dissolve. He is not his own but bought with a price, even with the precious blood of Christ, and therefore he should seek to glorify his Saviour and his God with his body and his spirit which are His. And let us observe how the resurrection of Christ is referred to in the text. We are not merely to endeavour to please Him as

we would seek to carry out the wishes of a dear departed friend. Our love is not merely for a Saviour who has died, but for One who is alive again: Who sees and knows and protects us; Who is now sitting at the right hand of God, where He liveth, not only to make intercession for us, but also to receive the homage of our gratitude and the tribute of our love.

In order, then, that the love of Christ may thus constrain us by producing a corresponding love in us, let us meditate much and frequently upon this glorious theme. And oh! what an attractive and commanding subject for meditation! always fresh, and always inexaustible! Think of its *incomprehensibility*; it passeth knowledge; it is far beyond the grasp of every finite understanding! Think of its *perpetuity*, throughout the unending ages of eternity love shall be the brightest gem in the Redeemer's Kingly Crown, the offshining splendour of which shall ever constitute the light and joy of Heaven! Think of the *expensiveness* of its sacrifices; it brought the Prince of Glory down to writhe with agony in the garden, to endure the excruciating tortures of the Cross! Think of the *preciousness* of the benefits it confers; it restores the sinner to the favour of God, and after the toils and the turmoils of this present life, it provides for him an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away. Meditations now upon the love of Christ will best prepare us for contemplating the infinite amplitude of his love hereafter, when we shall see Him as He is, in His robes of glory, seated on His heavenly throne; when instead of a reed for a sceptre He shall wield the sceptre of Omnipotence; instead of a crown of thorns His brow shall be encircled with a royal and immortal diadem, and when we shall be permitted, if we have washed our robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, to take our stand amongst the sanctities of Heaven on that high vantage-ground of observation from which Gabriel looks upon the King in His beauty. And

Now unto Him who proved His love
By coming from His throne above
To bleed and die for us,
To Him be glory, honour, praise!
To Him our grateful songs we raise,
Who hath redeemed us thus.

He washed us in His precious blood,
He made us Kings and Priests to God,
That we might reign on high,
Exalted at His own right hand,
Within the great Emmanuel's land,
Throughout eternity.

The Rev. Thos. W. Mossman, rector of Torrington, author of a *History of the Early Christian Church* and the translator and editor of *Cornelius a Lapide on the Gospels*, has received, with a complimentary note from the Premier, a grant of £100 from the Civil List, "in aid of his labours in the literature of ecclesiastical history."

"A DOOR OF HOPE."

By the Rev. H. P. LIDDON, D.D.,
Canon of St. Paul's.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday Afternoon, April 11th, 1880.

"I will give the valley of Achor for a door of hope."—Hosea ii. 15.

NO Israelite, we may be sure, could have heard this language from the lips of Hosea without being deeply moved, for it would have carried him back to the early history of his race, when, under the Divine guidance, his forefathers were taking possession of the promised land. It would have reminded him of a great failure, and, as the word "Achor" means, of a great trouble—nay, of a great tragedy. It implied to him that history was repeating itself, that old sins were to be followed by old punishments, and that beyond those punishments, as of old, there was hope. Israel, in Hosea's days, was largely apostate and idolatrous. It was again morally and spiritually, although not literally, in Egypt, encompassed by and yielding to the attractive fascinations of a widespread idolatry; and the old sins were to be followed by the old discipline. "I will allure Israel and bring her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably unto her. And I will give her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope." Here, as so often in the Prophets, Israel is addressed as the bride, too often as the unfaithful bride, of the Lord Jehovah; and the wilderness from which vineyards were again to be given her, and the valley of Achor which was to be once more a door of hope, would have suggested that while the generations and the centuries pass, God remains unchanged in his purposes of mercy and of judgment—the same everlastingly. The valley of Achor recalls those early days, of which we have lately been reading in the daily lessons, when, under the captaincy of Joshua, Israel was taking possession of the land of promise. The memory of a deed of heroism or a deed of blood seems in the minds of men to hang somehow about a narrow valley, as though the human imagination read in the rocks which close in on this side and on that the eager witness of inanimate nature, pressing forward to express its mute sympathy with the champions of right or with the victims of cruelty.

Had Glencoe been in the lowlands of Scotland its associations with one of the darkest crimes in the history of Great Britain would, ere now perchance, have been at least enfeebled, but a framework of natural beauty surrounds the scene of the tragedy and condemns its authors to at least an earthly immortality of shame. The valley of Achor lay along the line of Israel's advance from Jericho to Ai. When Jericho had fallen, the invading host of Israel moved on towards Ai, and three thousand men were sent forward to conquer it. As the entire population of Ai was only twelve thousand

it would have seemed that three thousand fighting men were advancing to an easy victory, and yet the three thousand fled before the men of Ai, and this so suddenly and with so little effort of resistance that only thirty-six of them were slaughtered. The demoralisation of the Israelites was complete. The hearts of the people melted and became as water. It was a critical moment, and Joshua, as was his way, lost no time in asking for guidance and for help. He rent his clothes, and fell to the earth upon his face before the Ark of the Lord until the evening, he and the elders of Israel, and put dust upon their heads. He asked God, with reverent boldness, why so much had been done for Israel only that help might be withdrawn when it was needed most, and what would be said among the heathen of Him, the Lord of Israel, if, after covenanting to give the people the land of Canaan, he should now permit Israel to be destroyed. Joshua was told that it was a time for action rather than for prayer. If Israel had been smitten before the heathen, it was because Israel went into battle in a moral condition answering to that of a man with heart disease, and only to be paralysed by the weakness which came with secret sin.

We shall understand this if we remember that Israel was not only a nation, but Israel was a Church, and its wars, when they were in accordance with the will of God, were carried on for moral and religious objects, just as the wars of the surrounding heathen were carried on for purposes connected with their material interests. In conquering Canaan and destroying its inhabitants, Israel was carrying out the sentence of condemnation that had been passed upon a race quite exceptional in its corruption; and as Jericho was the first city of Canaan that was taken, it was devoted, as our Authorised Version less happily renders it, "accursed" to the Lord, in order to show that the conquests of the land was God's gift to Israel. In other cases the cattle and the property became the booty of the victors, but Jericho was devoted as the first-fruits to God. With the exception of Rahab, every living thing was put to death, and the spoils, silver and gold, were to be brought into the treasury of Israel. Such was the order, but Joshua was warned that it had been disobeyed. Some of the devoted treasures had been stolen, and the theft had been covered by deceit. If Israel had been merely a secular heathen people, the moral character of its soldiery might have mattered little. As it was, sacrilege and lying meant for Israel physical weakness, and if the career of victory which had been begun was to continue, the Israelites' first duty was to discover and punish the offender. "For thus saith the Lord God of Israel, there is an accursed thing in the midst of thee, O Israel: thou canst not stand before thine enemies, until ye take away the accursed thing from among you," and then took place that solemn enquiry which we all remember as children as among the most stirring incidents even of the Book of Joshua. In the early morning the host was marshalled tribe by tribe, in its social and military array, and the lots were drawn; they were drawn as they were afterwards, in the cases of Jonathan and Jonah, to discover the guilty. It was felt that on this occasion, an occasion of such moment to the welfare of Israel, a higher power would preside, and that when the lot was cast into the lap the disposing thereof would be from the Lord, and so, as the inquest proceeded from tribe to family, and from family to household, and from the collective household to its several members, the meshes closed more and more closely round the sinner who had brought on Israel this ruin and this shame. The tribe of Judah, the family of the Zarhites, the household of Zabdi—those were the steps by which discovery advanced towards Achan. Achan was Zabdi's grandson, and a person himself it would seem of substance and consideration, and Joshua pressed Achan to glorify God by telling the truth, and Achan confessed that he had taken and hidden away the rich robe of Syrian manufacture, and two hundred shekels of silver, and a solid wedge of gold. They were found, as Achan had said they would be found, hidden in the earth beneath his tent, and the proof of guilt was complete; and then what follows can only be told in the language of the Bible: "And Joshua, and all Israel with him, took Achan the son of Zerah, and the silver, and the garment, and the wedge of gold, and his sons, and his daughters, and his oxen, and his asses, and his sheep, and his tent, and all that he had: and they brought them unto the valley of Achor. And Joshua said, Why hast thou troubled us? the Lord shall trouble thee this day. And all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire after they had stoned them with stones. And they raised over him a great heap of stones unto this day."

Achor, as you will have observed, is the Hebrew word for "trouble," and Joshua gave the valley this name from the likeness of this word Achor to Achan. It was in truth a terrific act of penal retribution by which Achan and his family met their deaths, and it requires an effort to ask ourselves how the spot which witnessed this scene of torture and of shame could be a door of hope. It was then, first of all a door of hope for Israel, because Achan's sin, while undiscovered, had about it this terrible distinction, that in an eminent degree it brought with it weakness and ruin to the public cause of Israel. Israel was not fully pure-hearted while the Assyrian robe, which ought to have been burnt, and the gold and silver which ought to have been placed in the treasury of the Lord, were sacrilegiously hidden away in the earth beneath Achan's tent; and a serious effort, like the attack on Ai, revealed the presence of moral unsoundness somewhere which, so long as it festered at the heart of Israel, made further progress impossible. When Achan had been discovered and punished, Israel's weakness at once disappeared. The Lord

turned from the fierceness of his anger and Ai fell easily before the first assault. Achan's sin was not, let us observe, an open scandal which brought dishonour on the cause of God by its publicity. It was not in this respect like the sins of the sons of Eli who made the Lord's people to transgress, nor like the sin of Jeroboam who made Israel to sin. It was akin to that of Ananias and Sapphira, not in its precise form, since Achan took what never had been his, and Ananias kept back part of that which he had vowed to give to God; but certainly in its motive, which was covetousness, and in the deceit which was employed to shield him, and in the fact that what was taken in the one case and kept back in the other belonged to God; so that the offence had the aggravated character of sacrilege. Such secret sins are more common than public ones. They satisfy the sinful instinct more economically, and those who commit them are tempted to pursuade themselves that because they do not corrupt others by the taint of bad example they are really much more venial. Such, no doubt, would have been Achan's view of his case—at least he kept his wrong-doing to himself—at least he had not persuaded others to join in this sacrilege and in concealing it he was all alone—at least he had not had fellowship with the deceitful. Ah, we often wonder why great causes fail or flag, why so little comes of schemes for doing good into which much heart has been thrown, and for which great sacrifices have been made, why the results are so poor or disappointing of enterprises or societies for propagating the faith, or for setting on foot works of charity, or for maintaining the Christian character of education, or for improving public conduct in this respect or that, or for carrying morality into legislation, or into the relations which exist between nations professedly Christian. We count up, we measure, we lay stress on the difficulties of the undertaking itself, and we satisfy ourselves that these difficulties furnish the real reason of the failure. "Ai," we say, "is too strong to be taken, its soldiers are more than a match for the men of Israel." May it not be that all the while the true cause of failure lies nearer home, that something is hidden away in the tent of the soul, hidden beneath the earth, which one conscience at least that is concerned in the enterprise cannot forget, and that this fatal memory makes the heart sick and unnerves the hand when the time for decisive action comes? And moral weakness, mark you, is contagious; it radiates from soul to soul just as does moral force. We feel its presence by a sure though inexplicable instinct, when we cannot give an account of it to ourselves or to others; but in any case those invisible beings who are the witnesses of all human efforts, and above all, He who is their Lord and ours, see well and clearly what is really the case, and the enterprise is blessed or rejected accordingly. Depend on it, dear brethren, that as the strength of the Church of Christ lies not in her external circumstances, not in the support or the countenance which she may receive from the great or the powerful, but in the secret prayers and deeds of souls whose names are unknown, it may be, on earth, but already registered in heaven, so the weakness of the Church lies not in the number or fierceness of her enemies, which God may and does turn to his praise, but in the secret unbelief and sins of her children. Achan, Judas, Diotrephes, these had a fearful power of traversing God's purposes of mercy; and perhaps if we knew more, as one day we may hope to know, what are secrets of the moral government of the world, we should see how God acts at times even now by his Providence as He acted of old by Joshua; how men are removed with swift decisions from this earthly scene because they bring to the cause of truth and goodness that moral paralysis and collapse which comes with cherished wrong-doing, and how their removal restores the public vigour and hope which their sin had forfeited. We dare not, of course, think of individuals, but the general laws of God's government do not vary from age to age, and the subject is surely full of warning for each one of us. None of us are too high, none too low to promote or to weaken the cause of Christ in the world, and *salus populi suprema lex*—the well-being of God's Israel from age to age is the law of God's constant government, and the valley of trouble for the individual wrong-doer is the door of hope for the Church, for the nation, for the race.

But the valley of Achor might have been a door of hope for others than those survivors who passed on to the conquest of Ai. The fate of the sons and daughters of Achan was one of the stock objections to this part of the Bible narrative which was urged by the Deists in the last century; and I suppose that a child reading the Bible for the first time, and with the interest which the narratives of this part of Scripture always possess for children, it does seem hard sometimes that the sons and daughters of Achan were made to share in the dreadful punishment of their father. And here it is by no means sufficient to say, with a recent writer, who means at least to be religious, that the history before us only illustrates the sanguinary severity of Oriental nations, which has in all ages involved the children in the punishment of their father, for we cannot but remember that the Jews had received a law which has specially insisted on the sacredness of human life, and it is difficult to see how the slaughter in question was other than a high crime against the Sixth Commandment, unless it could appeal to some independent principle, which justified and explained it. It is, indeed, more than probable that Achan's family were, to a certain extent, accomplices in his sin. They must have been privy to the concealment of the stolen spoil in the tent, and they knew what was involved in stealing and in concealing it. But, besides this, we cannot doubt that Achan and his family are here regarded as forming, in some sense, a moral

whole, and not simply as a set of individuals, each of whom was on his or her trial, Scripture does take these two views of human beings. Sometimes it treats us as each one entirely separate from all besides, both in probation and in judgment; and sometimes it merges the individual in a wider association of which he forms a part; and whether it be the family, or the race, or the church, or humanity, it merges him in it so completely as to treat him as though he were merely a limb of the great whole to which he belongs, and both of these views of men are true to, and they are based on, the nature of things, since man is by the terms of his creation at once a personal being complete in himself, and yet a part of a larger organism—the human family. On the first of these aspects the gospel, no doubt, specially insists, but it does not by any means ignore or dispense with the second. When the Apostle tell us that in Adam all die, and that by one man sin came into the world, and death by sin, he treats every descendant of Adam as part of a family which is united in its natural head, and which is fatally compromised by the acts of that head. This principle of the reality of a common human nature which we all share explains our loss of righteousness in Adam; but it tells to our advantage even more decisively, for it explains our recovery of righteousness in Christ. "In Christ shall all be made alive," "As by the disobedience of one many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

How can this be unless Christ, too, is the head of a family which He endows with His saving righteousness, just as Adam endowed his descendants with a legacy of sin and death, a family which is united to Christ by the gift of His new nature through the spirit and the sacraments just as truly as the older and wider family is connected with Adam by the tie of natural life transmitted in the way of human generation. This principle of the solidarity —if I may be allowed the word—of human beings, tells for good as it tells for evil; and just as Levi, though in the loins of his father Abraham, paid tithes in Abraham to Melchisedek, and so determined the character of his priesthood, so Achan's act compromised his family in a real sense which cannot possibly be ignored without rebelling against the facts of nature as well as against the teaching of Scripture; for, putting revelation altogether aside for the moment, do we not see the operation of this law in the physical and social life of man written in characters too plain to be mistaken? What means that inheritance of impoverished and diseased life which a parent, whose frame has been shattered by excess and debauchery, bequeaths to children or grandchildren who are yet unborn? What means the transmission, with the gift of life, of a moral character and predispositions—a transmission so certain as to have suggested the error that the personal soul itself is transmitted instead of only being impressed by the transmitted organ which encases it? How can we deny that good or bad circumstances of an earlier generation, that the splendour of the great name or the forfeiture of all self-respect, are, whether we will or no, a fatal entail from parents to their children? There is no mistaking these facts of human nature, and when Christianity tells us of an original sin descending from Adam and of a gift of righteousness descending from Christ, it grafts those high doctrines on facts which are already matters of experience and which no true philosophy of human nature can possibly ignore. Achan's children were involved in their father's guilt on a somewhat like principle. As they had shared his credit and standing in the ranks of Israel, so they shared the shame and the pain of his fall, and yet when this and much more that might be said has been said, a higher justice still asks whether the destruction of all the members of Achan's family is fully accounted for. Do not your hearts, my brethren, echo this repressed murmur, do they not whisper, "Your theology may be right, but there is something in our moral sense which is still unsatisfied"? The truth is that we see here a deeper sense in which the valley of Achor was a door of hope. In order to explain the tragedy which is witnessed we must resort to that larger conception of the destiny of man which was affirmed with varying degrees of distinctness by the Jewish revelation. If all ended with this life it would be difficult if not impossible to explain occurrences of this sort consistently with the belief that the world is governed by an absolute and unerring justice. It would seem as if there was no room in this visible world for such a justice to take adequate measures—I will not say for self-vindication but for self-satisfaction, and so all is quite purposely left incomplete with the deliberate intention of making belief in a future life inevitable for all who believe in a moral government of the world.

Certainly those who do not believe in a future after death are perfectly right in taking as they do the very gloomiest view of our present existence; while on the other hand faith in such a future enables us to understand how the tragedies of human life and history are strictly consistent with the moral attributes of God. If any members of Achan's family were punished beyond the measure of their personal deserts in respect of Achan's crime, the valley of Achor was for them a door of hope. It opened into, it suggested a future life in which all would be more than redressed by a just and holy God. No doubt in later ages than Joshua's the separate relation of each individual soul with God was more distinctly marked by revelation. When Ezekiel's contemporaries complained that the fathers had eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth were set on edge, Ezekiel proclaimed that "the soul that sinneth it shall die," and that "When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive;" and Christ our Lord, if I may say so, yet further extricated the individual soul from the mass of human nature and placed it face to

face in an awful and a blessed solitude with the mercy and with the justice of God. Each Christian is redeemed as though redemption had been wrought for him alone; each is to pass through death to judgment as though the Judge of all the world had only to do with a single soul, and yet the law which makes us part of a vast family is not thereby cancelled. Since death, which awaits us all, is a legacy of our first natural parent, life is full of blessings and of sorrows which come from those who have preceded us. The fate of Achan's family was as much a prophecy of a coming adjustment of deserts and awards as the fall of the Tower of Siloam, or the Tay Bridge disaster. It left accounts to be settled in a vast hereafter, and it was thereby a door of hope. Nay, is it not at least possible that to Achan himself the valley of Achor may have been a door of hope? We dare not dogmatise, but his confession at the instance of Joshua is not without traces of a true repentance. He was no Judas, hurrying by his own act into the presence of the Judge, and God may have spoken to his soul in those last moments of agony and shame, and he, on his part, may have used the last efforts of will that were at his disposal to accept his punishment as deserved, and as coming from God; and if this was the case, Achan's lot was, in reality, happier than that of others who have sinned as he did, but who, in this life, have escaped punishment. "Some men's sins," says the Apostle, "are open beforehand, going before to judgment, and some men they follow after;" and surely of these the last are in the worst case, when everything which conscience threatens, and which justice renders inevitable, is reserved for the future. Achan was punished here; his trouble may have been even to him a door of hope; and the general truth, which is independent of the cases of Israel and of Achan, that the punishment which God sends may open the way to life's choicest blessings, or to blessings which lie far away beyond it, is too plainly written in Scripture to be mistaken. It was true for the Israel of Joshua's day, it was true for the Israel to which Hosea addressed these warnings so full of sternness and of love, it is true for every one of us now, true for individuals and for great bodies of men, true for parties, for nations, for churches. We cannot use our Psalter with any approach to intelligence or sincerity without confessing it. "Before I was troubled I went wrong, but now have I kept Thy word." "It is good for me that I have been in trouble, that I may learn Thy statutes." "I know, O Lord, that Thy judgments are right, and that Thou of very faithfulness hast caused me to be troubled." "Heaviness may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." "Blessed is the man whom Thou chastenest, O Lord, and keepest him in Thy law." Surely at this season of the year the truth receives its highest consecration at the sepulchre of our risen Lord. He, indeed, was in Himself, holy harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, but in His love and condescension He took upon Him the whole weight of human sin. He became in Gethsemane the representative penitent. "He was made sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." To Him also the valley of trouble was a door of hope. The passion was the herald of the resurrection. "Being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore, God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name;" and it was for the hope that was set before Him that He endured the cross and despised the shame. What is of most importance is that when trouble comes to each one of us it should be recognised as coming from God, and accepted as His will, as due certainly to our sins, and therefore as the best thing possible that could happen.

Many a reverse in life is relatively worse for a man than Israel's defeat before Ai. Many men die in their beds in more painful tortures than did Achan in the valley of Achor. Nothing sweetens family anxieties, failures in business, mental anguish, the loss of friends, the inroads of illness, the felt approach of death, so effectively as this conviction that the trial is from God, and that there is therefore, if we only will, a hope beyond it. Of this hope Easter is the warrant and the consecration, and the more simply and truly we hold communion with our risen Lord, the better shall we be persuaded of the reality of that hope within the veil, sure and steadfast, which makes all trouble not merely tolerable, but, to God's true servants, welcome.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 7, 1880.

WE will answer our correspondent "C. R's." questions concerning Circumcision to the best of our ability; but we are not theologians, like himself of wide knowledge and great logical power, and therefore should have been more pleased if he had stated his views on this important subject

in more detail. Of course there is a wide difference between Circumcision as a sanitary measure and a religious ordinance, but assuredly not wider than between the tokens and our own Christian sacraments. Water, bread, and wine are all of them most excellent and in truth indispensable sanitary agents. There is a large and conclusive mass of evidence to show that the token of the Jewish Sacrament prevents the sins of impurity in boyhood, the infection of manhood with a loathsome disease which endures for five or six generations, which Mr. Thring so well described in his most useful sermon last week as causing more diseases and deterioration of health than all other preventible diseases put together, and obliterating the image of the Creator, morally as well as physically, in the Creature, besides preventing local cancer and several other painful diseases. If it remove the means of weakness and debility and strengthen the muscular fibre and mental tone of the body, is it unreasonable to infer that it will likewise to an equal degree improve the moral faculties of man? The mind and body are so intimately connected and interdependent that whatever improves the health of one is sure to improve that of the other. This, we think, is proved by experience, because we see that Circumcised races, as Jews and Turks, are much more moral than Christians. They are as a people absolutely pure from the sins of intemperance, improvidence, and inhumanity, and they observe the Ten Commandments very much better than Christians. Of course Circumcision does not make eunuchs of men and expunge the strongest and healthiest passion in the human race; but by improving the muscular fibre and moral tone, it tends to give a man greater control over his necessary appetites and passions. It cannot surely be argued that the mere tokens, excellent as they are as symbols, of the Christian Sacraments produce *per se* any moral effect on human nature. Our respected correspondent would not have us believe that the sprinkling of a few drops of water on an infant, or the partaking of a small portion of bread and wine by an adult, would *per se* without faith and obedience promote the moral purity of man, and "so have any right to be considered as a Divine command valid for all ages." The essence of all three covenants is of course the same, viz., faith and obedience; without which all three are morally null and void. The token of Abraham's covenant has the advantage, in addition to the sanitary ones, of recording an indelible mark on the human body, consequently is never forgotten, but remains the symbol of an everlasting covenant. The real objection to Circumcision we take to be that the covenant of which it was to be an *everlasting* token is merged in that of Baptism. If Circumcision is not obligatory on Christians is it so onn Jews? We think too little consideration is given to Circumcision by Theologians.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CIRCUMCISION.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—Touching Circumcision, do you not think there is a wide difference between it as a useful sanitary measure, and a religious ordinance? Again: Do you think that its effect, in the case of the Jews, for instance, is to further moral purity, or only to increase the chances of non-infection? I can conceive it doing the latter, and believe it on the word of a great medical sanitary authority, like Dr. Gibbon; but does it have any effect in the first direction? Will a circumcised person be less liable to violent sexual desire? *This* is the only *moral* point of view in which it could have any right to be considered as a Divine command valid for all ages.

C. R.

———:o:———

"INDIFFERENTISM AND SCEPTICISM."

Sir,—Archdeacon Denison's solemn words of warning suggest another very practical consideration, which I would fain press upon the attention of English parents—viz., the very sad neglect of religious instruction which prevails in many of the schools in which the sons of our gentry are being educated.

Parents are too apt to take it for granted that when a school is presided over by a head master in holy orders, assisted by tutors likewise in holy orders, with "divinity" figuring prominently in the curriculum and advertisements, their boys are really and systematically instructed in the truths of revealed religion, as well as in the history and doctrines of the Prayer-book, and that the spiritual well-being of their lads is carefully attended to.

Nothing has astonished me more, since I have had to select schools for my own boys, than the painful discovery that in many otherwise excellent seminaries religious teaching is all but entirely neglected, and that masters in holy orders, who have no other spiritual charge but their scholars, candidly justify their neglect by arguments which one would expect to hear rather from the advocates of a purely pagan system of education than from men set apart for the Christian ministry. I could easily illustrate this by abundant examples.

Is it to be wondered at that so many gentlemen's sons, who left their homes at the early age of eight to ten, should come back to their parish priests at fifteen or sixteen ignorant of the very rudiments of religious knowledge? What wonder that, as a very competent authority has within the last week informed me, so large a proportion of our Civil Service men land in India practically bereft of religious faith? What wonder that so many of our highly educated English gentlemen and members of Parliament betray a most lamentable ignorance of the history of the English Church, and of the plain teachings of the Book of Common Prayer? What a mockery that we Churchmen should make such an ado about the religious education of the "masses," invoking the aid of diocesan inspection, giving of our means, perhaps personally instructing, or, at least, insisting upon religious knowledge being daily imparted to the children of the poor in our national schools in every parish in the land, while the religious life of our own children is being in so many cases literally stunted and starved out by systematical neglect!

Though well aware that there are many—very many (woe to us if it were otherwise!)—noble exceptions to this truly alarming state of things, I deem it, nevertheless, my duty to communicate to other parents the result of my own personal inquiries into this important matter. The remedy for the evil lies entirely in the hands of those who commit their children to the care of others. Masters, after all, must represent public feeling in these respects. And surely Bishops, who admit schoolmasters to the priesthood, should exact from their ordinees some solemn pledge that they will regard their scholars as their peculiar spiritual charge; else, what is the meaning of such men seeking the priesthood?

Hurworth-on-Tees, July 31, 1880. JOHN IRWIN.

—:o:—

SIR,—English Parents who have sons at school in Paris may not be aware that as a rule they are not taken on Sundays to an English church, but at best to a French church; if, indeed, they are not left to spend the day as they like. There are, doubtless some exceptions among the masters, but I find, as a rule, that an English boy at school here is practically let live like a heathen as far as public worship is concerned.

Nor do I think English fathers will be satisfied even when their sons are taken, more or less regularly, to a French church, for too many French churches are very far from being places in which an Englishman would like to see his child. Indeed, even where they are Evangelical, the language, forms, and whole worship are so different from our own, that the old associations of home, so powerful with the young, have nothing to evoke them.

The one reason given for not bringing English boys to their own church is that the French hour for *déjeûner*, that is, practically, lunch, is generally half-past twelve, and English worship does not let those who attend it get home till a quarter to one! As if the religious interests of lads were not worth the putting back lunch a half-hour or less, once a week! Instead of this, however, when the boys do come, they are led out of church to the great disturbance of all, while the service is going on, to be home in time!

If all parents who have children here would kindly inform teachers that it is imperative that they be taken regularly to church, and if no boys be sent in future to a Paris school except with this condition, an evil will be stopped which leaves the young to grow up in France, at the most critical time of their life, without any respect for religion.

CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE,
Rector of Christ Church.
Boulevard Bineau, Neuilly-sur-Seine, Paris.

ST. PETER'S, BOURNEMOUTH.

At a representative meeting of the clergy and laity of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, held at Sir Henry Taylor's residence on Saturday, July 31, the following protests, addressed to the Bishop of the diocese and to the patron of the living, were drawn up, recording the general sense of the injustice which has been inflicted upon the congregation of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, by the nomination and appointment of Bishop Ryan to the vacant incumbency. 1. "To the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester.—As the acting officers of the district and congregation of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, we are requested by a representative meeting to present to your lordship, as our Bishop, a respectful but firm protest against the subversion of our rights and privileges by the appointment of Bishop Ryan. While we recognise that the appointment is unquestionably legal, we submit that it is not in equity, nor can it be considered morally just. We view with extreme apprehension the results this appointment will have, not only upon the church and town, but also upon the interests of the Established Church, so seriously affected by this abuse of patronage. (Signed) Rowland Hill, curate-in-charge of St. Peter's; Henry Salt, M.D., W. Scott Evans, churchwardens; Alex. S. Bennett, curate-in-charge of St. Swithun's; F. Colville Hyde, George F. Fenwick, sidesmen of St. Swithun's." 2. "To Sir G. Japps Gervis Meyrick, Bart. Sir—As the acting officers of the district and congregation of St. Peter's Church, we are requested by a representative meeting to record a final but firm protest against the subversion of our rights and privileges by your nomination of Bishop Ryan to the vicarage of St. Peter's, Bournemouth. While we recognise that you are acting strictly within your legal rights, we hereby make protest that this nomination is not in equity, nor is it morally just. Not only will it destroy our existing Church privileges. but it will most seriously affect our peace and welfare, and we submit, sir, that in insisting on the nomination you endanger the rights of all lay patrons (by bringing the question of lay patronage to an issue), and you strike a direct blow at the interests of the Established Church itself. (Signed) Rowland Hill, curate-in-charge, St. Peter's; Henry Salt, M.D., W. Scott Evans, churchwardens; Alex. S. Bennett, curate-in-charge, St. Swithun's; F. Colville Hyde, George F. Fenwick, sidesmen, St. Swithun's."—Friday was observed by the congregation of St. Peter's as a day of special intercession for the needs of the parish, the following services being held, and being well attended:—6 a.m., Holy Communion and meditation; 8 a.m., Holy Cummunion and meditation; 10 a.m., Matins; 10.30 a.m., Holy Communion and meditation; 12 (noon), Litany and Intercession; 3.30 p.m, Litany of the Church and Intercessions; 5 p.m., Evensong; 8 p.m., special penitential service and address. A special circular which was issued stated as follows:—'Owing to the extreme difficulty of the circumstances—the fact that an appointment to the vacant benefice has been made—the risk of even seeming to use prayer as a weapon of offence, and of unreality in using language of submission, when conscience prompts resistance—it has been decided to avoid misunderstanding, if it may be, by not having addresses during the day of prayer. It would be next to impossible to avoid some chance expressions capable of misconstruction, and of being used to keep personal feeling alive, instead of, as is wished, bringing the matter to the ground of Christian principle and the revealed will of God. There will be a few words, to direct the prayers of the congregation, spoken by the parish clergy at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and there will be a concluding address after the eight o'clock service by the Rev. John Oakley, vicar of St. Saviour's, Hoxton. This will leave faithful hearts and wills to a large extent free to pray as they are taught by 'the Spirit Who maketh intercession for us.'"

A form giving suggested topics for prayer was also issued, prayers being desired as follows:—1. For the unity and peace of the Church. 2. That our divisions and "offences" may be overruled for good; and may tend to increased confidence in the Divine mission of the Church of England, and more living faith in the Divine Head of the Church, as "with her always." 3. That the original constitutional system of the Christian

Church may be more fully restored in England, according to our needs and the changed condition of society. 4. That private rights and interest and tastes may be freely surrendered by all Christian people, for the good of the whole Christian body. 5. That all the funds and temporal endowments of the Christian Church may be less regarded as a property, and more as a trust, both by clergy and laity. 6. That the great end of all the temporal endowments of the Church—the promotion of the Christian life—may be considered first by all who are intrusted with any of them. 7. For the Bishop of the diocese. That God's grace and guidance may be given him to use such influence as the law allows him in favour of peace and justice, and reasonable consideration for the present congregation. 8. For the "patron." That he may be led to construe a legal right in the largest spirit, and with reference to the welfare of the whole Church, and not only to local or personal interests and feelings. 9. For the clergyman neported to have been nominated. That he may seek and find light and guidance in a very difficul situation; and may act on the "golden rule," with prudence and charity. 10. For the clergy, parishioners, and congregation of St. Peter's. That they may endeavour, while firmly resisting injustice, to act and speak and think justly and soberly and charitably of and to others.

Speech day at Oakham Grammer School.—On Wednesday, the Agricultural Hall, Oakham, was crowded by a large and fashionable company, amongst whom we noticed the Lord Lieutenant of the County (the Earl of Gainsborough), Lady Constance Bellingham, Mr. and Miss Wingfield, A. Duncan, Esq., B. Adam, Esq., G. H. Finch, Esq., M.P., and Mrs. Finch, W. Wing, Esq., and Mrs. Wing, R. Tryon, Esq., and Mrs. Tryon, Rev. J. de Mowbray, and a large number of the neighbouring clergy and parents of the scholars. As on former occasions, a large number of the "old boys" were also present, testifying to the great interest they still feel in this ancient School. We are glad to be able to state that Archdeacon Johnson's School is not only, under the able management of its masters, regaining its former standard of excellence, but it is also increasing numerically, having since last Speech-day increased from forty-eight scholars to seventy-eight. A. C. J. Johnson, Esq., one of the trustees, remarked tkat he hoped they were about to see a different state of thiugs to that which had formerly existed, and that the School was now being revived. The duty he had to perform was a very pleasant one. He had been connected with the Trust of that School for sixteen years, and was very pleased to see the prizes on the table, for it was an evidence that something must be going on in the School.—The Head Master Rev. E. Vere Hodge, M.A., who was received with hearty cheers, said he ought to thank very heartily those who were in attendance, many of whom had come at great inconvenience to themselves, and had travelled many miles in order to be present that day. They were certainly improving in numbers; this time last year they had forty-eight boys, now they had seventy-eight—in fact forty new boys had been added to the School since last year. Now they were providing ample accommodation from them; three pleasant class-rooms were growing up, and they would have boys to fill them as soon as they were ready. But they were anxious to get a new house to take in more boarders, for until they could do that their numbers must be rather fixed. He hoped and believed they had made some progress in regard to knowledge, and he did not think he should be doing wrong in saying that as regarded mathematics the examiner on that subject had made anything but uncomplimentary remarks. In referring to the honours that had been gained, he was pleased to remark that a Johnson Exhibition at St. John's College, Cambridge, had been gained by Simkin, and the Rutland Scholarships had been gained by Turner, Oakham, and Hawthorn, Uppingham. The speaker then referred to the antiquity of the School, and said next year they would enter upon the 300th anniversary of the School's history, and he thought they ought to try and show that the spirit which caused it to be founded was not yet dead; he therefore proposed that they should ereot some building to commemorate that event. Some of the "old boys" had promised to subscribe very liberally towards that object, and he hoped by next Christmas a subscription would be raised, and that next summer they would be able to show that something had been done in the way of celebrating their tercentenary.—The Examiner, J. T. Hutchinson, Esq., M.A., said this was the second year he had examined at Oakham, and he was very pleased at the satisfactory state of the School. They had many great advantages, and he thought they would succeed. It was always a difficult matter to get up a School after it had gone down as Oakham School had done, but he thought it a good omen that Mr. Hodge had so soon and successfully turned the tide. He was very pleased to hear that their numbers were increasing, for he thought a School of a hundred boys and upwards much better than a School of under a hundred. In speaking of honours he thought that not only the public at large, but the schoolmasters themselves made too much of honours. The best test of a School might be applied in the following questions:—Do the boys all work with energy and play with energy? Do they like the masters, and are the parents satisfied with the way in which the boys are treated? The speaker then referred to Schools with which he was acquainted where the study for honours was made a great feature, and to other Schools where the scholars spent more time upon sports. In the speaker's opinion the best thing was to combine these two, and as far as he could judge they were combined in this School admirably. He would only say he was satisfied with the results of his examination; there was a great improvement from last year, and he was glad to find that an excellent feeling existed between masters and boys.—G. H. Finch, Esq., M.P., one of the Trustees,, entirely concurred with the remarks of the examiner as to the means to be adopted for educating the mind as well as the body. He hoped the scholars of Oakham School would go on gaining prizes as they had done. They always heard of the county prizes being taken with the greatest pride. He hoped when the boys celebrated their tercentenary, even if they did not find a new house, they would celebrate it in a hearty manner. He was very much obliged to Mr. Hodge and the assistant masters for the way in which they had maintained the honour of the School.—Lord Gainsborough said it was very satisfactory indeed to hear the report of the examiner, and he was always glad to hear ol the increasing numbers and prosperity of the School.—The Rev. F. Hawley, vicar of Worksop, said as an "old boy" of the School he was very glad to be there on that occasion. He hoped what had been thrown out by the head-master with regard to celebrating the three-hundredth anniversary of the School, would be carried into effect. He was sure several of the "old boys" who were in various parts of the country and the world would be very glad

to assist the School as far as they could.—The following is a list of the prizes: Christmas Prizes—6th Form, Chapman. 4th Form, Turner 1. 3rd Form, Sills 4. 2nd Form, Hawthorne 2. History, Swift.—Midsummer Prizes.—6th Form—Classics, Wright, Mathematics, Wright. 4th Form—Classics, Turner 2, Mathematics, Turner 1. 3rd Form—Classics, Bell, ma., Mathematics, Higginson 2. 2nd Form, Oldham. 1st Form, Sikes. French—6th Form, Whitby. 4th Form, Tweed. 3rd Form, Higginson 2. German—Turner 2. Drawing, Whitby; Music, Douglas 1; Science, Hawthorne: History, Wright; Writing, 1 Shaw, 2 Simmonds.—After the conclusion of business, the platform was transformed into a stage for the representation of the classical drama in Latin, Greek, French, and English. The selections were admirably rendered, and were worthy of the hearty praise which was accorded by the audience. The following is a programme of the recitations given:—1. Plautus—Aulularia. Conversation with a father-in-law, who is unwilling to give a dowry; the son-in-law enumerates all the tradesmen a lady employs. *Euclio*, Wright; *Medadoris*, Metcalfe. 2. Shakespere—King John. Arthur pleading with Hubert for his eyes. *Hubert*, Besch; *Arthur*, Chapman. 3. Aristophanes—Acharnians. A Megarian, nearly starved through the long war, at last is allowed to come to the Athenian market. He sells his sons dressed up as pigs. N.B.—He speaks the dialect. *Megarian*, Wright; His Sons, Hawthorn ma., Higginson mi.; *Dicaioplis*, Besch; *Informer*, Metcalfe; *Agoranomoi* (Police). 4. Skakespere—Henry IV. The men in Buckram. *Falstaff*, Besch; *Prince*, Wright; *Poins*. Whitby; *Bardolph*, Metcalfe; *Drawer*, Chapman, 5. Bruey's L'Avocat Patelin. M. Patelin avoids payment of debts to M. Gillaume by feigning delirium. *M. Patelin*, Besch; *M. Gillaume*, Chapman. *M. Patelin's* brother, Metcalfe.

At a council held on Tuesday week, the treasurer, Mr. Hinde Palmer, M.P., presiding, the Rev. Charles James Ball was elected Chaplain of Lincoln's-inn, out of a large number of candidates, in the place of the Rev. Henry Wace, who was recently appointed the preacher on the resignation of Canon Cook. Mr. Ball took his degree at Queen's College, Oxford, in 1872, and was ordained by the Bishop of London in 1874. He was head-master's assistant in Merchant Taylors' School 1873-5; curate of St. Gabriel, Pimlico, 1874-5, and of St. Clement, Eastcheap, 1875-7; Townsend Lecturer, St. Magnus, London-bridge, 1877; and is the author of the *Merchant Taylors' Hebrew Grammar*.

BOOKS, &c., RECEIVED.

"Christian Certainties." By Gordon Calthrop. Eliot Stock.

"Church of England Hymns." G. Thring. Skeffington and Son.

"Everlasting Punishment." Dean Goulburn. Rivingtons.

"Clergyman's Magazine." Hodder & Stoughton.

"What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment." Professor Pusey. James Parker & Co.

"Inspiration of Holy Scriptures." Dean Bagot. Hatchards.

The Centenary Sunday School Bible. Oxford Press Warehouse.

"The Churchman" for August. Eliot Stock.

"Good Words." Isbister and Co.

"Sunday Magazine." Do.

The *Oxford Diocesan Conference* will take place on Thursday, October 7th. After celebration of Holy Communion at the cathedral at 8 a.m., there will be meetings in the Sheldonian Theatre from 10.30 a.m. to 1.30 p.m., and from 2.30 p.m. to 5 p.m.; and on Friday, from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., and from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. The following notices of notion have been received:—The Right Hon. Sir R. Phillimore: "That the recommendations contained in the report of the Royal Commission on the question of sale, exchange, and resignation of ecclesiastical benefices approve themselves to this conference."—The Archdeacon of Buckingham: "That this conference desires to thank the Convocation of the province for the labour bestowed upon the proposed revision of the Book of Common Prayer during a period of seven years."—The Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P.: "That an address be presented to Convocation urging upon them to take steps, by application to the Crown and Parliament, to enable such alterations to be carried into effect."—The Rev. R. H. Pigott: "That it is the duty of members of the conference to see that the sanitary and other acts passed for the benefit of the poor in their parishes are more carefully carried out than at present is the case in many districts."—Sir John Conroy, Bart: "That in the opinion of this conference, it is desirable that the sittings in all churches should be free and unappropriated."—Professor Burrows: "That the progress of the temperance movement has been seriously hindered by (1) the fanaticism of certain total abstainers; (2) the advocacy of severe methods of legal repression; and (3) by occasional indiscreet political action on the part of the advocates of temperance."—Mr. J. R. Crook: "That this conference desires to see the Book of Common Prayer brought into fuller accordance with the principles of the English Reformers and the Act of Uniformity more strictly enforced."

—:o:—

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Appleton, Rev. B., fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, examining chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.

Baker, Rev. Charles, rector of Wappenham.

Ball, Rev. Charles James, chaplain of Lincoln's-inn.

Bardesley, Rev. Joseph, rector of Stepney and rural dean; vicar of Bradford.

John de Soyres, Rev., chaplain of Cronstadt.

Knollys Foster, Rev. Bernard, curate of South Wimbledon; Minor Canon of Gloucester Cathedral.

Lambert, Rev. J. C., vicar of St. James's, St. Helena.

Meynell, Rev. Francis William, rector of Watermillock, Cumberland.

Middleton, Rev. John Douglas, vicar of Holy Trinity, Cowes; chaplain to the Royal Yacht Squadron.

Scaife, Rev. Henry Wilkinson, perpetual curate of Mardale, Westmoreland.

Wildman, Rev. Thomas, incumbent of St. Andrew's, Callender; examining chaplain to the Bishop of St. Andrew's.

—:o:—

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Halcomb, Rev. Thomas Robert, fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, on the 22nd ult., at Nice, aged 47.

Jefferson, Rev. Joseph Dunnington, of Thicket Priory, Yorkshire, canon of York and incumbent of Thorganby, on the 31st ult., aged 73.

Lloyd, Rev. Charles William, thirty-two years rector of Aldham, Suffolk, on the 28th ult., aged 70.

Smith, Rev. Henry, vicar of Barnby, near Newark, on the 18th ult., aged 73.

The Church of England Pulpit.

RESULTS OF DENYING INTELLIGENCE IN THE UNIVERSE—FINAL CAUSES.

By the Rev. E. T. CANON LEEKE, M.A.,
Canon and Chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral.

Sermon Preached at Request of Christian Evidence Society,
at All Souls', Langham Place, June 27, 1880.

I HAVE been asked to speak to you this afternoon "upon a very difficult subject," the results of denying *intelligence* in the "universe." All that I shall attempt to do will be to offer you a few simple thoughts which have been of use to myself, in the hope that *some* (at least) of those here present may find the same simple thoughts helpful to themselves. I propose to throw what I have to say to you into the form of answers to two simple questions.—(1), "Is the World a Machine," and (2), "Who made the Machine?"

Will you try to believe that it is not from any idea of how well I can put a subject like this, that I stand here to day? I knew very well, before my name was put upon the paper, that I had got a task a great deal too hard for me; and I have learnt to know it better and better every day since.

Some people fancy that it is a dangerous thing to wake men up to think. Their idea is, I suppose, that the only people to be trusted to think are *themselves*, and that the others had best be content to have their thinking done for them by other people. It seems to me that man, that *you* and I, that *every* man however low fallen from the high place which he was made for, *is still* made for something better than to eat and drink and sleep, and that the power (sadly ruinded in many men) is given to us by the Great God to *use*. "Well! But these are wide subjects. And you may treat them so badly that you will do more harm than good. We do not fear men being roused to think, but if you don't take care you may be so awkward in your way of waking them that they will get up on the wrong side, and go right off towards unbelief. You may very likely raise questions which you cannot set at rest." Yes! I know there is a great deal in *this*. And I know too well that I have got hold of a subject which is far beyond my powers. But then, you and I are *brothers*, and we are travelling on together, and a few years ago we *were not*, and in a few more years the grave will close over our bodies, and it is a very solemn question, a *family* question for *us* brothers, where the path leads to that we tread.

There are plenty of mysteries in the world, plenty of things that it is terribly hard to understand. And these mysteries are far nearer to us than we think. And it does *no* good—not a *bit*—to shut our eyes and pretend that all is right and easy, and that there is no need to trouble about things. I know *just* the way in which some shrewd men of business do their *religion*, just as they would do any bit of *routine* work; are terribly shocked at any bit of Ritualism or touch of false doctrine, pretend to shudder at the bold assertions of unbelievers, or even at the honest doubts of sceptics; go to church all right in the morning, and possibly go with their wives to the Table of the Lord, and yet have got nothing that would stand a shock. They are religious from habit, not from conviction; they go to church, just as a working-man goes to the club or public-house on a Sunday. Is it not one great way to knock us out of these easy-going ways, if we can come face to face with some of the hard thoughts that are to be found in plenty round us. I believe *that* is one good which God will bring out of the outspoken doubts and denials of the present day: that men will become more *earnest* in their religion; that they will be more of the temper of the soldiers that answer to the cry for volunteers to clear the enemy from the dark cavern; more of the temper of the martyrs who have met death unflinchingly sooner than deny their Lord.

And first. "Is the world a machine?" "Yes" and "No."

It depends what you *mean* by a machine. If you mean a clock, wound up to go for a certain time, with the weight running down or the spring expanding; or if you mean an engine, with steam up and the boiler full of water, and the furnace well supplied with fuel; *these* ways of looking at the world will not *do*. They may do for a *shallow* man, but directly a man begins to think, he sees that this way of looking at things will not account for the world. Because, what *is* the world?

Why does a *clock* go, when it is wound up? Because of the *weight* or the *spring*.

Why does the engine work, when the furnace is alight and the steam up? Because of the expansive force of the steam.

But there is something *outside* the clock to make it go; and there is something outside the engine, too.

Why does the spring in the clock want to expand? What *makes* the weight heavy and want to run down? What *gives* the steam its expansive power?

What enormous forces are stored up here ready for use!

You cannot *tell why* these things are, nor can *any man*. Suppose you are able to use a few scientific terms, and say that the spring expands through the laws of cohesion or of molecular attraction; or that the weight is *heavy* because of the law of universal gravitation, according to which every particle of matter attracts every other particle, according to a law depending (for all practical purposes) on the

inverse square of the distance—the grand discovery of Sir Isaac Newton; or that the expansive force of steam is merely a particular case of a general law including all vapours and gases; are you any nearer knowing *why* these things are?

If you take a pendulum clock from here up to the North of Scotland, it will go quicker than it did here in London, even if the temperature and all the other conditions (so far as you can tell) are the same.

Now *why?* Because in the North of Scotland we are nearer to the earth's centre than we are here; because, as we get farther and farther from the Equator and nearer and nearer to either the North or South poles, we are getting nearer to the centre of the earth; because the earth is something like an orange, flattened at the poles.

Well! But what has this to do with it?

Why! The earth's attractive power grows greater the nearer we get to the centre, and the greater this attractive power, the quicker the pendulum swings. So, on the top of a mountain, it is easier to boil water than it *is* below, because there is less weight of air above the mountain top to hold the steam down (i.e., to prevent the water boiling) than there *is* below.

You know that if water be heated in a close iron vessel with a safety valve, that the water will rise about two hundred and twelve degrees before the valve opens.

Well, now! More and more (of late years) men have been grouping these various facts together, and seeing that they are not all isolated *facts*, but can be arranged under what we call "general laws." But we are not any nearer the *reason* of the thing.

We have got a good bit farther than the ancients, who used to think that an eclipse of the sun was caused by some angry monster beginning to devour the sun, and that the monster must be frightened away or we should be left in eternal darkness. An eclipse of the sun is known to depend on certain causes and can be accurately predicted, as we know, and so has ceased to terrify us. But *why* there come to be all these forces in the world, where the *chemical* and *electrical* forces *come from*, we are not any nearer the solution of this mystery, because we have learnt that they all seem to be parts of One Great Force.

The clock goes with the *weight*. There is what we call "gravity" outside it to make the *weight* run down. But what is there outside "gravity"? What is there *outside* all the *chemical* and *electrical* forces in the world? Where does the *force* come *from*? We cannot answer *this*, except by letting our thoughts go *out* and *up* to a *Great First Cause*.

Is this unscientific? Nay! It is the truest science. And in *this* you will find the *greatest* men of science agreed. Then the world is not a *mere* machine, for there is *force* in it, there are what we call "natural laws" which must depend for their existence and continuance on a *Great First Cause*.

This is our answer "*No*," to the question "Is the World a Machine?" But, in the course of this answer "No," we have seen that there is another answer "*Yes*." And it is *this* answer that I would rather that you and I should contemplate than the answer "*No*."

It *is* a machine, and a very glorious machine, but in every single part of it we see *God*. Take it as it *is to-day*. The Sun shedding forth its light and heat across the ninety millions of miles which separate us from it, and across the same vast interval swaying our earth with its mighty attraction and causing it to swing round year by year, as the ball swings round when we hold it by a string. What a wonderful machine were this world, if *this* were all!

But there is *more*. Look at the buds putting forth in the spring sun to-day. The grain of wheat falls into the ground, and (presently) the green blade shoots up, and the harvest ripens. The acorn puts forth the tiny shoot, and at last the mighty *oak* stands firm though rocked by terrible tempests.

What a wonderful machine is the world which can produce all *this!*

But there is more than *this*.

The tiny *egg* becomes a larva; the *larva* becomes a chrysalis; the *chrysalis* turns into a butterfly. What a wonderful machine is the world, which can produce all *this!*

Is it any answer? does it make the thing *less wonderful?* to tell us that in the *egg* are wrapped up all the powers and the possibilities from which come the larva, and the chrysalis, and the butterfly? Nay! It makes it *more* wonderful still.

But there is *more* than *this!* There is *man*, with all the wonderful mechanism of animal life, but with a something *more;* a *wonderful* something, mysteriously interwoven with animal life, yet separated from it; a power to know and to choose the good; a power to follow out and to understand the laws of the universe; a power to look *throngh* these to *God*.

All *this* we find in this wonderful machine which we call the world!

This world is most wonderfully made, is a most wonderful machine, if you like. No machine made by man ever worked so smoothly or ran so true!

Men tell us—some men who call themselves men of science, yet leave out the *greatest* fact of *all*, the fact of God—that this machine of the world is made so well that it is *useless* for us to think that *God* ever touches it. They are thinking, I suppose, of the old story of Humphrey Potter, the boy who was set to turn the cocks of Newcomen's steam-engine, more than one hundred and sixty years ago, to let in the steam to the cylinder at the beginning of each stroke, and the water at the end of it to condense the steam. You know the story—how the boy managed to get time to play by tying strings to the cocks, and so making the engine its *own* turn-cock. They think (I do not want to speak profanely) that to give God His proper place in the machine of this world would be setting Him to turn the

cocks in Newcomen's engine, and that (the engine being its *own* turncock) there is no more need for God.

We have seen that in this glorious machine which we call the world everything (does not tell us there is *no* God, but) points us *to* God.

But there is another thing men say. They say the machine is very beautiful in *one* way, yet very *ugly* in another; they say "Nature is terribly *cruel*." The germs of a fatal disease enters a home, and the dearly-loved children, or the father, or the mother, or the whole of them are swept away. Or there is one false step, and the life is crushed out in the terrible fall, whether it be life of *king* or of the *lowest* in the land. Or the bullet speeds its way unswervingly and falls harmless or crashes through the brain of the brave commander leading on his men to victory. Nature cares not; Nature is cruel. Is God *here?*

Yes! God *is here;* but this is only one little bit of the road that stretches out through infinite spaces. If this were *all* of Nature, if we persist in looking only at one little bit, and if we persist in declaring we know *all* when our vision only reaches (on *this* earth) to the hour of our death, then we cannot wonder if we get strangely puzzled and upset in our thoughts of God.

It is a great truth, that the final end to which all things tend is the highest good; that the machine which the Great God makes and the Great God upholds is the *best possible* that *could* have been made; but, if we want to see this clearly, we must know all things, or at all events not *pretend* we know all, when we know hardly *anything*. It would be a great advance in knowledge for myself and for you, if we could learn a little of how little we *do* know. May *God* teach us to be humble!

There is a beautiful passage in one of Joseph Cook's Boston Lectures, something to this effect: "Suppose that to-morrow morning the sun should rise, and across its face (in letters brighter than its own light) there were written for all the world to see, 'Holy! Holy! Holy! Lord God of Hosts, Who was, Who is, and Who is to come.' One would think that under that awful light, as it passed over the continents and seas, and from people to people, the dark tribes of heathendom would cast down their idols,—that (in the great centres of civilization) avarice, malice, and dishonesty, those horrible serpents that writhe along our streets, would wither to ashes,—that literature, politics and art, on their chilly heights, would feel, as it were, the warmth of spring beneath this touch of supernatural fire, and that, as the sun with its wonderful letters of light passed round and round the world, there would peel off from the diseased and burdened earth something of the ulcerous growths of sin, and a new living surface be brought to view. To those who see with the secret eyes of science there *is* this 'Holy! Holy! Holy! written in living light across the sun; and not across the sun only, but across *every* natural object, the seas, the mountains, the forest arches, every lowliest violet, the human frame."

You and I want to learn to read God's Name across the pages of the Book of Nature. There has been a grand reading of the Book of Nature the last fifty years! Volumes that had never been off the shelves have been got down and studied, other volumes that had never been understood because they were written in a foreign language, have been got down and mastered; at least, men tell us they have mastered them. Well! What has come of it all? It is a good thing that God's Book of Nature should be read; but lots of people have only looked at the title pages of the volumes, or the headings of the chapters, and then go and pretend they know all about it, and they do what they are quite *sure* to do, declare that the book teaches what they knew all along, that man is made to please himself, and that God, if there *be* a God, takes no notice of the common things of this everyday world. Chemistry, geology, astronomy, physiology! They just open these books, and then coolly tell us that there is no room for God in the world, for that these Books of Nature have told them so; whereas the strange thing is that God Himself wrote the Books and gave them to us to read, and gave us the sense to read them!

"Who made the machine?"

There are plenty of people who are living without God in the world, "Fools, who say in their hearts, there is no God." And there are plenty of people who, as we have just been seeing, take the volumes of God's Book of Nature off the shelves and pretend to read them, and then tell us, "There is no God." But it is a truth more and more getting fixed and settled as the years go on, that men who are real earnest thinkers, *cannot* give any other answer than *one* to this question, "Who made the machine?" Their thoughts pass on and on—back from *one* cause to the cause which stands behind *that*—until they come at last to the Great Frst Cause. Him Whom we call God. Some of them do not like to use His *Name*, they try all shifts, in their pride of heart, to keep *out* of saying that God stands above all things, and that all that we *have* we owe to Him; but they *have* to say it at last, they cannot get out of the fact that *above all things*, behind the whole great machine of nature, there stands God. We *have* a machine, so we saw a little while ago, running *most wonderfully*. This world *is* a very glorious machine. The sun, with its mighty attractive force, causing our earth to swing round it year by year! The grain of wheat, and in a few months the ripening harvest! The full-developed butterfly springing from the tiny egg! *Man*, with his mysterious powers of good and evil choice, with his *more* mysterious immortality!

A very glorious machine!

Ah! But it is terribly *cruel*, if you can call a machine cruel. It does not mind *who* it crushes, if they get amongst its wheels.

Yes! And you must remember that *this world*, this *machine* of which we have been speaking, does not only contain what we call the *blind* forces of nature, the stones and the thunder, and the plants, and animals, but that it contains *man*, and that when we talk of people getting *crushed* in the machine, we have all the dark facts of *sin* to face, it is not only the hundreds going down in the waters of the Thames, but the hundreds and the thousands and the millions going down (so far as *we* can see, *for ever*) beneath the *sea* of *sin*.

But here *is* the machine.

There is plenty that it is very hard to understand. We think, sometimes, in our folly and presumption that we could have improved upon it. We are weighed down with horror, sometimes at the awful ruin which sin is causing in the world. But here *is* the machine.

And who *made* the machine?

It *has* not run for ever; it goes against the first principles of clear thought to think so. And it did not start itself; that is just as absurd to think. But it owes its origin (as we have seen) to one Great First Cause, to Him Whom we christians call God.

It is the fashion for some men, who call themselves men of science, to say now-a-days "Oh! yes. There *is* a Great First Cause; we are not so foolish as to think that *matter* can come of itself, and *force* come and grow of itself, and the buds and the flowers and the nerves and the muscles get built up by chance; we are not so foolish as not to see that there is a *Cause* behind all this, that there is a *Mind* and a *Will* behind all that exists, and behind all the forces that act in the world. *But* we can *know* nothing of this Great First Cause, this Mind, this Will, from the Book of Nature. We know there *is* a Cause, but there our knowledge stops." Then they go on to laugh at us Christians for believing that we have another Book—the Bible—given to tell us about God.

Now some Christian men get frightened and muddled and begin to think, "Perhaps after all, these men of science are right about the Book of Nature, and we *cannot* find out much about God from *it*. Don't let us waste our strength in defending *this* line, but let us retire to the inner circle of fortifications—the Bible—and hold *that*." *These* are not the sort of soldiers to defend our Fatherland. We want men to stand *up* to those who would tell us we cannot know God from His works, and to maintain the fight bravely along the whole line.

This world, this wonderful machine, not only tells that there *is* a Great First Cause, but tells us a great deal *about* Him. It is childish folly to say it *does not*.

It is true, we cannot know *all* about Him from His works, for *that* would make it necessary for us to know *all* about His works, not only that *has* been, and that *is* and all the reasons of all changes, but all that *might* have been and that may *still* be.

But what we *do* know of His Works tells us about *Him*. Though we know not *all*, yet we know something, and the *piece* of knowledge which we *have* of Him (from *that* portion of His works which we *do* see and know) is true knowledge, and to be depended upon so far as it goes.

"There is no creature," says one who is himself an authority in science, "no creature great or small, living or lifeless, which is not able to contribute some spark of light towards a fuller manifestation of the Great Creator. '*All* Thy works shall praise Thee, O Lord.' Some of these works may be mute for a time, or men may be deaf and fail to catch their heavenly melody; *but* St. John's vision is the true clear-sighted vision of the world, every creature which is in heaven and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, heard I saying, "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever."

Suppose we think about *that* part only of the universe which is *without* life. An infinite number of particles of matter, each with its properties, its forces, each with its *place!*

Whence came this matter? Whence came each particle in the place in the place it holds to-day? Whence all these forces?

Everywhere is the Great First Cause! *Everywhere* is God! Then we know *this* of *Him*, of God, that He is *everywhere!*

"God is *everywhere*!" So the Book of Nature teaches us. He Who made the machine, His Mind, His Will, is actively at work in every part of it. As we see the machine, even the lifeless part of it, we see God; as we see it working, we see God's Will at work, manifesting itself.

And, as we begin to look upon the parts of the machine which are *alive*, how still more wonderfully we see God working! By what mysterious power does the wheat-plant draw up into itself the particles of grit which it requires to build up a firm straw strong enough and elastic enough to bear the ear and to lift itself after it has been bowed by the passing wind? By what mysterious power is nerve, and blood-vessel, and muscle, and bone woven (each in its own place, each by the inweaving of the suitable particles) in animals and in man?

One Who has *all* knowledge is *here*! And One Who has all Wisdom!

There is a *plan* here! There is *thought*. And (for *thought*) we must have One Who *thinks*.

And *we* are *here*. And there is such a thing as *goodness*. You and I are so made that we know that there are things which we *ought* to do; we are so made that we *know* the right ought to be followed, and the wrong to be turned away from. Apart from all positive commands, which may make special things right for us (or wrong), there is an idea in each man's mind of *right* and *goodness*.

Well! He from Whom all things come. He from Whom *we* come, must be One in Whom is all *goodness* and all *right*.

Is all this nothing? One Who is *all-wise, all-good,* one Who *thinks* a *Personal* God!

More and more, as men read the Book of Nature, they will find that *this* is written across every page. This is what science must bring us *to* at last.

And this God is *here*. It is an *awful* fact, a fact in whose presence our words must fail.

We may *forget* it, but our forgetting it does not alter the *fact;* as we find the words of the Jewish King, written though they *were* 3,000 years ago, true to the latest science. "Thou knowest my downsitting, and mine uprising. Whither shall I go from Thy spirit, or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there: if I make my bed in hell (in the *grave*), behold, Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me." Day by day, along the commonest path of daily life, we are walking in presence of our Judge, within the light that shines from the Great White Throne!

THE RECEPTION OF BRADLAUGH INTO PARLIAMENT.

By the Rev. W. B. PHILPOT, M.A.,
Vicar of South Bersted, Bognor.

Sermon Preached at South Bersted on Sunday, July 4th, 1880.

"He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house."—2 John 9-10.

THIS charge was addressed to those whom St. John calls "the elect lady and her children"—St. John, who knew more of the mind and heart of the Master than any one else then or since.

Some have regarded the elect lady and her children as the Church at large. Whether this were so or not, a piece of Divine advice given to one family would hold good for the whole Christian family on earth, and for any national branch of that family. Therefore to England, if she could only be regarded as one happy family, the Apostolic advice would apply—"If any man rejects the Son, and therefore the Father, receive him not into your community, much less into your house—your House of Representatives."

This application of the text obviously, however, goes upon an ideal, on which, as things are now, and as they are likely for a long time to be, it is utterly impossible to act. It is a sad thing to have to confess, that our beloved country cannot act upon the order of our beloved Master; but now, as a matter of fact, I repeat, she cannot. The Master Himself, by His Spirit working in His present and living Church, says: "No; ye cannot bear this now. Ye must receive such into your house; My laws cannot now be carried out into their fulness of detail." So, like the sap in winter, Christ's ideal draws itself back into the root of State-life, and must lie hidden for awhile in "the law within the law." In the coming summer of humanity, when leprous sin shall melt from mortal mould, and shall have died down out of the spirits of men, then, and not till then, Law will "commeasure perfect freedom" in the full foliage of action. Then the day will come when those who do not acknowledge Christ, and therefore God—for these, in the nature of Personality, stand or fall, are honoured or are dishonoured, together—will be allowed no place in the government of the State, probably not even as electors, much less will they be received into "the House." Yet do not for a moment suppose that Christianity is going to back water in the river of freedom, for Christ says, "If the truth make you free, ye shall be free indeed." All the true freedom which men now enjoy is in fact due to Christ; just as all those delicate shades of morality, about which men and women write such pretty books, are due to the working of the Spirit of the same Jesus Whom their authors and authoresses so jauntily deride. No. It will come about in this way. When men have grown really free—free from false ideas that confuse them, free from demagogues that mislead them, free from unfair class-interests that hamper them, free from selfishness that cramps them, free from that residuum of the old Adam type which still lingers in their blood—then they will look into the perfect law of liberty; they will not be forgetful hearers of the Word, but doers of the work of God; they will shake off a thousand shackles of misconception; they will discover that Christ is their only intelligent Counsellor; they will find, when they prove the matter in a business-like way, that Christianity is, after all said and done, the only true political economy; for Christ's principles, as they will come to learn, alone reach to the roots of moral disease, and can save the ratepayers from the ruinous waste of poor-rates and goals. And when men see that Christ is the cheapest as well as the best Guide, they will not allow the right of citizenship to men of other principles, and will not receive stunted and defective natures into their House.

But I am anticipating. For reasons which would be too long to go through here, we cannot now as a matter of fact refuse to receive into our House of Parliament anybody whom this or that constituency may choose to send there. We cannot realise for a long time the ideal of the Christian State, the Church State of the future. The Christ that *is* can only be potentially regarded as "The Christ that is to be."

The Roman Catholic Church has all along been trying to realize this ideal—a grand but foolish endeavour; and this is why she clashes and why, precluding herself from reconsidering her decisions and replanning her course, she always *will* clash, and will clash more and more, with the modern world. That Church has for ages been in confusion, and has thrown the world into confusion. Her im-

posin order covers organic disorder. More than half these national troubles and disasters are the result of that inveterate badness and congenital madness of Rome. She first made her House different on many main matters of construction from the House of Christ, framing it so that some of the best men must decline to cross her threshold; and then she arrogated to herself in the plenitude of her earthly grandeur, that she was forsooth the only possible form of the House of Christ; and thus she refused to go upon the principle of Open House, and she shut out from her portals the divinely-growing ideas of the human race. Therefore, however numerically strong—as Turks, Infidels, and Heretics of all sorts are at present strong—she has more and more isolated herself from the current of human progress, and the modern world goes on without her. We see how her Bishops, because they clash with the fair needs of the State, are dislodged from Germany; and how her Jesuits, because the enemies of ordinary and necessary freedom, are ousted from the best and freest France there ever was. If they find shelter here, it is only because Great Britain is free enough to let all extremes, from Northampton to the Propaganda, speak the thing they will. England seems to go upon her common proverb, and to think it well to give every principle, even the absence of principle, sufficient rope, under the calm conviction that, if that principle be a bad one, it must in the long run make away with itself. I do not say it is always wise to give this rope, but suffice it to observe that it is at present the character of our nation and the recognised mode of our progress to do so.

This is perhaps not the best place, nor certainly would you spare me the time to attempt now so hard a task, as to mete the limits of tolerance, or to discuss whether it ought to have *any* limits; but it is a fact to which we must bow, that even the intolerant, even the godless, must now be tolerated, nay, be received into our House if the constituencies send them.

The matter runs into such infinite ramifications, and so many things, most of them important, present themselves to say, that the difficuly is to choose what not to say even more than to choose what to say.

I will say a few things which naturally come uppermost in your own minds.

I would point your attention for instance to this:—that, lamentable as are the antecedents of the individual whose name has been unhappily prominent in the last week, these are but accidental, and are not essential to the question at issue. To speak of this man in public is not trespassing on the reserves of private character, for he has "gone before to judgment." It is certainly the most offensive thing which could have happened that this particular man, with the restless arrogance which marks the irreligious, should have been the man by whose demand this relaxation has necessarily been made for receiving anybody and everybody into our House. I have not seen it so taken, but I should indeed myself have thought that the unrepentant joint-author of a book condemned by the Judges as being of a criminal tendency and injurious to the State, might on this ground have been self-excluded from our House. For he has open to him now a career in which he may himself come to advise the appointment, not only of Bishops of the Church, but of the very Judges of the land. The great talents which have enabled him to paralyse ministers, and to shake and remodel the Constitution, may carry him or others like him to the highest place, so as even to be the first servant of the Queen, or of a Commune. The people of Northampton find very wide sympathy among kindred masses throughout this land. The franchise is soon to be extended so as to embrace vast constituences of unfit folk. Since this man has succeeded in shutting out God as the acknowledged universal Power from the House, which has lowered its conditions to receive him, and thus from the public school of the *men* of the nation, so it will soon follow that it will be deemed an intolerable intolerance to name the Name of God in the public schools of the *children* of the nation. These children will be the voters, the masters and lords of the proximate future. There is nothing to prevent, but much to induce them, as the awful years roll on, to send a vast majority of such men to be received into our House, and some other Bradlaugh, if not this, may one day be the leader of such a terrible majority. The Church by that time will have *gone* as a sovereign element of the State, and probably the Sovereign also will have gone. There must however still be judges, and we cannot suppose that judges will be appointed who would differ from those who appoint them; and so right and wrong in the land will have scant authority to distinguish them. The majority then will be at liberty not only to think and speak, but to write and publish and to teach in the schools what they will. This being logically the possible result of receiving men into our House on whose book the judges have passed condemnation, I say that on this ground one might fairly have thought that there was at least some *primâ facie* reason for declining to receive this particular man into the House.

It might seem at first a pity that the claim was not set up by, and the doors thrown open to, some quiet and so to speak inoffensive infidel, and not to one whose words and works make his reception so offensive. And yet perhaps this is only a piece of the irony of Providence; to show, I mean, by a patent example and in a strong blaze of shame, the condition to which that nation is reduced which begins in its House by the dishonouring of the Son. By so clear an example is it shown to History and to the world, that when a public body, the representatives of a nation, enacts that *Christ* need not be acknowledged, the Father and the Holy Spirit soon also

say "Let us depart." Thus perhaps it is quite in keeping with propriety, if I may so say, that the man through whom this is done is one by whom our common sense of decency has been publicly outraged. The lesson would not have been so marked had a man like Mill, in some respects a fine specimen of the first Adam type, been the first in English History to refuse to say as well as to mean "So help me God;" but as it is we can see better what we are being driven to. "It must needs be that offences come—." The rest of the sentence I leave to the Judge of all mankind.

Parliament is also punished, let me add, for having long ago ceased to be a distinctly Christian body, by its having thus suffered the loss of corporate honour. It used, till the other day, to be a club that had an united sentiment, a feeling that could be outraged, an honour that could be trampled on, a dignity that could be offended, a majesty that could be hurt. That was a sentiment which this man has now blown to the winds. No other assemblage of men in the world would have admitted to their membership a man who had plucked off their sacred form and blown it in their faces, even supposing it *were* but a form. Henceforth however our House has, alas, no public honour that can pretend to be hurt; for now that the breath of God has ceased to inspire its organism, what does it become but a dangerous miscellany of individuals, representing isolated groups, and having no living Central voice to overawe their vices and vagaries. Having been forced to swallow this affront, and having now no longer any public recognised divinity to hedge it, there is no deeper mire through which it may not henceforth be dragged. But when the Spirit of God is thus trampled upon, it is natural, and perhaps well, that together with *His* honour, the common honour that cometh of men should go along with it. So condign is our punishment for having once dropped the Christian ideal in our mode of national expansion. Such is the penalty that descends on a people who grow free, not *in* Christ, but *from* Him. God grant that our end be not that we perish for ever.

In Germany there are some sects whose deputies need not say, "So help me God!" But why? Because they regard the Great Name as too sacred to use.

Even in Spain the deputies lay their hand on the open gospels, and the President solemnly says, "If you do your duty, may God reward you, if not, may He call you to account."

Even in the United States, whose republican institutions are, we had thought, the model of what are called with grotesque arrogance "advanced politicians," every representative, even of communities where civilisation has been running to seed, still solemnly says, "So help me God." While here in our own beloved and favoured England—the shelter of fugitive kings, the refuge of all distress, the most Christian nation upon earth, as far as inorganic Christianity goes, a man must now be received into our House who comes in with open blasphemy on his lips, and branded with immorality by the sentences of the courts. He takes his unblest place, like one that says no grace before his meat, to stamp his vile principles with the name and authority of a legislator, and to strive to undo that Church, of which his Sovereign is still the earthly Head, and Christ always the Heavenly Master. Surely the nation itself may well say, "Help us, God."

Except all indignation be henceforth counted intolerance, the man who has done this must expect such feeling as I have expressed from the ministers of Him against whom he lifts himself; unless, indeed, we imitate the courtesy with which a man thanks his executioner. Yet let us not forget, when we pray, as we now more earnestly should do for this High Court of Parliament, that all its members come in for the benefit of our prayers.

The Parliament has been described as going through a series of convulsion fits. Well; we read that, when evil spirits were *cast out* by the power of Christ, the spirit tore the man so that he wallowed foaming before he came to his right mind. Perhaps it was to be expected that, in a great human institution, when the converse occurs, and the evil spirit *enters in*, we should witness the like phenomenon. Those convulsion fits do not seem to have been very unnatural.

There are many lessons which I could gathe for you from these debates. Let me choose one before I close.

There have been expressions used by leading men to which as a minister of Christ I must take exception. One has described the infidel's state of mind as "unfortunate," and another has expressed for him a maudlin pity, as though he were merely to be commiserated, and were in no way to be blamed for not having "the power of belief." Time does not permit that I go deeply into this matter; but I will only say that, if a man from childhood up refuses to pray, puts God from his knowledge, feeds on infidel food, does not open his soul to the inflow of Divine Grace, forgets his baptism, tramples on his privileges, lets himself be carried on by the set of the current of his fancies, calls the blood of the covenant by which he was sanctified an unholy thing, and thus does constant despite to the Spirit of Grace, then surely God is not to be blamed by those who comments on his condition, and he has the wrong word applied to him when he is called "unfortunate."

The *Record* states that the rectory of Stepney, vacant by the appointment of the Rev. Joseph Bardsley to Bradford, has been offered to, and accepted by, the Rev. John Fenwick Kitto, rector of Whitechapel.

The new choir-stalls in the nave of Rochester Cathedral, in memory of the late Mr. Philip Cazenove, were completed last week, and add greatly to the appearance of that portion of the old cathedral.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 14, 1880.

"PREACHING CHRIST."

PAPER READ BEFORE THE DUBLIN CLERICAL SOCIETY, APRIL 5, 1880.

BY REV. F. R. WYNNE, M.A., INCUMBENT OF ST. MATTHIAS', DUBLIN.

I have heard fine ladies call some flowers *vulgar*. They grow so constantly in citizens' villas and poor people's cottage gardens that no person of refined taste would think of planting them or caring for them. But in spite of their being vulgarised in aristocratic eyes their real beauty is undiminished; and for my part I trust the day will never come when I shall be too refined to admire the brightness or appreciate the perfume of any flower that God has made. Words and phrases are sometimes vulgarised too. They are used often, and used by those who in the region of thought might be called plebeians; and so the mental aristocrats despise them. Thus it has fared with the phrase which forms the subject of this paper. It has become hackneyed. It is continually used by those who are neither original thinkers nor refined speakers. And now "preaching Christ" sounds rather like a "cant" expression, and there is a danger of its meaning being altered by those who do use it, and a danger of the importance of the thing it signifies being overlooked by those who shrink from its use on account of its abuse. I purpose to try in my rather hurried and fragmentary remarks to elucidate the real meaning and to indicate the life or death importance of the phrase that has become somewhat worn and dulled by constant use.

Whatever disagreement there may be as to what the expression means, most clergymen agree that it is our duty to "preach Christ." I say "most"—I cannot say *all*; for there is a school of thinkers who suppose they have got beyond that old superstition. Cleanliness, morality, temperance, goodness in some form a clergyman ought to preach. God, perhaps, a little but not too much; not much of the transcendental and of the supernatural nothing. A clergyman is but a kind of moral policeman whose business is to keep order in the state by the use of reasonable suasion instead of handcuffs or the baton.

I take it for granted, however, that we in this society have not "advanced" quite so far. We believe that "God who in sundry ways and divers manners spake to our fathers by the prophets, has spoken to us by His Son." We believe that "God was manifested in Christ Jesus," that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." I take it for granted that we believe in the reality of the facts implied in these apostolic expressions, and that we recognise our position as set apart specially to carry on in the world the great moral and spiritual movement begun by the Life, Death and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The first step, then, towards preaching Christ is manifestly to have firmly impressed upon the consciousness the fact that there is a Christ to preach. Let it be felt as the great central point of human history that God incarnate visited our earth; let the object of that visit be very prominent in the mind; that He came to bless us in the turning away every one of us from our iniquities; that He came to save His people from their sins. Christ's coming as the destroyer of moral evil—the firm conviction of this truth—the recognition of its intense, awful importance, is the starting-point for preaching Christ. We see men here—some altogether overcome and ruined by moral evil—all haunted and endangered by it. We believe that Christ came from Heaven to deliver them from it; we believe that we are called to carry on His work: that is why we preach Christ.

We perceive, also, that Christ did His work while in the world by attracting men to Himself. He did not, merely, show the consequences of sin, the foulness of it, the need of efforts of the will against it. All that had been found out long ago by bitter experience. But he laboured especially to produce union of the soul with the living God, union through himself. "Come unto Me," "Abide in Me," "Outside of Me ye can do nothing,"—The personal call to Himself was the burden of His teaching.

Such teaching then as will make Him be known, thought of, loved, trusted, and obeyed is that which will best re-echo His own instruction and carry on the work which he came to do.

Thus His apostles taught. They went everywhere teaching and preaching "Jesus Christ." They loved Him themselves with an intense personal affection. After His resurrection and the mysterious outpouring of the Holy Ghost, they combined with their love an awful adoration. They knew that He was their King and God, that He had died as a sacrifice for their sins, and that His was the only name under Heaven whereby men could be saved. They felt it to be the great object of their lives to make Him known, to have Him recognised as the Messiah, and to have the hearts of His people beat loyally and lovingly towards Him. Their preaching to the unconverted was an "opening and alleging that Jesus was the Christ." To their fellow-Christians it was still "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," "Christ in you the hope of glory," "Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

Their teaching was very varied. We have samples of it in the gospels, which re-produce for us the substance of the apostolic testimony, and in the epistles, which give us the very words in which they exhorted their people. They are often very practical. They enter into many details of their convert's daily lives. They are careful to guard against theoretical mistakes that were current in their day, as well as to warn against prevalent moral faults; but that which gave power to their teaching and evidently carried the hearts of their people along with them was their personal enthusiasm for the Lord Jesus. Whether trying to convert unbelievers, or to edify the Christian Churches, the wonder-working charm was the same—"*whom* we preach, warning every man and teaching every man, in all wisdom that we might present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

Two things, then, I think, we can perceive in the apostolic teaching which help us to know what is implied in healthy and real preaching of Christ. 1st—Their vivid exhibition of the Lord Himself. 2nd—Their way

of using thoughts connected with Him as the great motive power for practical suasion.

1. The apostles did not merely tell people to believe in Christ and explain to them the blessedness of believing in him and the misery of not believing. They did that, but they did much more. They made their hearers believe by telling them who and what He was. They told the story of His Life. They drew the beautiful picture of his character which we love to look at to-day, which makes us (almost involuntarily) as we look at it bow the head and worship. And still all effective preaching of Christ must be, like the apostles, *the exhibition of Christ.* Some preachers weary their audience by perpetual exhortations to "believe." "Do you believe? Are you sure you believe? Believe instantly and then instantly all is well. You have only to believe and you are safe and happy for ever." And some of the hearers grow tired of the perpetual iteration, and others feel that there is unreality about it somewhere, and that it does not meet their souls' needs. And there is a danger of their coming to imagine the teaching false which is indeed not false, but only unwise and disproportioned. And some turn away with a hopeless feeling that the Gospel is not for them. "Only believe" says the preacher. "Why that is the very thing I cannot do. I can command my acts, but I cannot command my feelings or convictions. I can say I will *do* this because I choose, but I cannot say I will think this or believe this because I choose;" and the objection is partly right. The will has *some* power, considerable power, over the emotions, affections, and even convictions; but it is not an absolute power. It is limited by law. The intellectual nature has its strict laws, and the emotional nature has its real laws, and in vain you give your orders in contravention to these laws. You cannot bribe me into believing or frighten me into feeling. If you promise me all the gold of Ophir I cannot believe that which my understanding tells me is untrue. If you threaten me with a million deaths you cannot induce me to love that which presents itself to my heart as unlovely or uninteresting. And so if our *only* tone of teaching was "believe and you are saved, believe not and you are damned," we should be preaching a gospel of despair. For we should be attaching life or death to conditions of mind which are in a great measure beyond the control of choice.

It is this, I cannot but think, that makes the preaching of many so-called evangelical preachers barren. Instead of preaching Christ they are preaching faith. Instead of telling about the Lord Jesus, and His love, and His work, and His promises, and His sympathy, they are ordering people, on pain of damnation, to feel in a certain way. And as the people cannot feel at the word of command, they only feel weary of the exhortation, and secretly sceptical about the promises and threats.

Very different was the method of the apostles. They did say "believe," "Believe and thou shalt be saved;" but with the same breath they showed what was to be believed, and why it was to be believed in.

So must be our preaching of Christ. We must strive to make the Lord Jesus be known. We must study Him ourselves; study Him in the written records, study Him in close personal heart communion with Him; and then, as earnestly and as vividly as God enables us describe Him to our people; Jesus in His beautiful human character; Jesus as he went about among men; Jesus teaching, rebuking, forgiving, comforting, working, praying; Jesus as the manifestation of what God is; Jesus as the propitiation for sin; Jesus as the risen Lord and King; as the present Saviour, helper, sympathizing friend: this is the great theme we have to speak of. True doctrines about Christ are important and useful, but only as they make Himself known; only as they guard against misapprehensions about Him or break down barriers between us and Him.

It is right, for example, to be clear and careful (as St. Paul was) about the doctrine of justification by faith. But why? So as to make it easier for the soul to rest quietly and trustingly on the divine Lord. What we really want is not that men should *hold* "justification by faith," that is only a *means*; but that they should *be* justified by faith—that is the *end*.

Some clergymen think it of great importance that in every sermon what is called "the way of salvation" should be explained. And so every discourse must have its exposition of "the three R's.—Ruin by the Fall, Redemption by Christ, Regeneration by the Holy Spirit." This may be very orthodox, but it is not preaching Christ. There is one who says "I am the way." The way of salvation is a Person not a theory. Tell worldly, thoughtless, careless people, or anxious, doubting, sorrowing people, formal, elaborate, and abstruse doctrines about Adam's sin and divine plans, and you are giving a stone instead of bread—a very hard stone, and very dry stone; perhaps not a stone hewn out of the mountains, but compounded by man's chemistry. Tell the poor people about their Saviour; get them to feel that a living divine Person is beside them; that he sees their own sins; that he thinks of their own selves, and loves them very dearly. Try to convince them of His tender sympathy, His awful holiness, His willingness to receive and forgive, His power to help and guide and comfort,—this is preaching the way of salvation. For it is making the personal Saviour known. Don't trouble yourself as to whether your sermon runs upon the regular orthodox lines or not; as to whether it brings in all the correct doctrines or not. Let your great ambition be to make the Lord Jesus known and trusted and loved and honoured. Say just what you believe to be true; say just what you believe to be useful at that particular time to those particular people. That, and nothing else, is the *doctrine* you are there and then bound to preach.

Here is our first lesson from the apostles. Let our main teaching be the exhibiting of Christ. We want men to believe, to love, to obey. We help them to it not so much by talking of faith or of love or obedience as by showing them the *object* of these affections.

II. And then in practical suasion let us use the Person whom we have been trying to make known as the principle motive power. A preacher of righteousness has to explain many details of the law of righteousness, and to announce very distinctly its solemn sanctions.

But as long as he is only a preacher of righteousness, though he may point the right way and the safe way, he cannot stir men to go on it. He wants motive power. In order to have this he must be a preacher of a personal God. There is never real goodness except for God's sake, and no one can effectually preach God except by preaching Him who is the manifestation of God. No one can show the Father but by helping men to see the only begotten Son who hath revealed Him.

The preacher wants to waken and stir the slumbering conscience, to make sin be felt as a misery, a shame, and a danger. He wants to comfort and soothe the anxious, the frightened, the doubting, the perplexed. He wants to help all his hearers to practical goodness,

to real daily and hourly efforts for the right and struggles against the wrong.

Like the apostles, he can best do this by bringing thoughts and truths connected with the Lord Jesus into vivid prominence before men's souls. The presence of the Lord Jesus now, His solemn coming by-and-bye, His invitations, His warnings, His promises, His example, His earnest call to each conscience, His perfect pardon to those who take refuge in Him, His full atonement for every sin, the grace sufficient He gives for every need, His tender and pitiful sympathy now, His welcome hereafter and crown of glory in His heaven—such are the levers for stirring the human heart which I am sure every man who labours among sinning and suffering fellow-creatures and tries to make them better and happier will always find the most effectual. He preaches penitence, he preaches peace, he preaches holiness by preaching Jesus Christ.

With a practical word I conclude. What will make us really preach Christ? Nothing, I believe, but what made His apostles preach Him—personal affection and loyalty to Christ Himself. It is possible to wish to "preach Christ" from a different motive. Those who are supposed by the public to preach Christ fully and faithfully gain thereby public confidence and approval. I do not say that this is wrong. St. Paul was anxious to approve himself to every man's conscience as well as to God. But it is certain that this state of Protestant public opinion, though it may be good for the public, brings with it a great danger to preachers. It is the danger of our wishing not so much to preach Christ as to be thought to preach Him; and such a desire is a treacherous snare. It leads to exggerations of statement and one-sided teaching, and repetition, and hackneying of certain popularly accepted phrases, and a cowardly suppression of unpopular truths. Instead of really grappling with men's consciences and speaking to them as the Lord Jesus would have spoken, and saying plainly what we believe in our hearts would do them most good, we are tempted to say what will sound most spiritual and evangelical, and so we cease to preach Christ. We take his name on our lips. But it is not Him we are wanting our people to admire. It is not Him we are longing and striving to have thought of. We are building up a pedestal for ourselves to stand upon, building it with that most sacred and awful thing, the name of Jesus. Oh! no matter how nice and sweet our phrases sound, are we not, if we yield to this temptation, only hypocrites and blasphemers.

And while some show off the preaching of Christ for popular favour, others, from the same motive, withhold the preaching of Christ. They want to be original, different from the ordinary run of preachers; they want to startle their hearers with intellectual and philosophic novelties and so they pass by the "old, old story" and look for something smarter and more suited for modern fashions and modern tastes. Only real personal affection for our Lord and Master can keep us from these dangers; can enable us to be earnest students of modern science, loving and sympathizing brothers to all our people, whether high or low, stupid or clever, and yet above and through all zealous proclaimers of the only name under heaven whereby we must be saved.

The poet describes to us how the wild Highland warriors used to be gathered for the battle by the passing from hand to hand of a fiery cross. So through the ages since the Incarnation, men and women are roused to the great battle against evil by the handing on of our "fiery cross," the gospel of the crucified One. Hot and flaming from heart to heart it has to be transmitted. We must not let it cool. Neither custom nor conventionality, nor bodily or mental indolence, nor intellectual or worldly interests must be allowed to slake its fire. Each of us as a sinful man must himself be often kneeling for pardon before Him who was crucified; each of us as a forgiven man and dearly beloved disciple must be continually in affectionate communion with the Friend who has laid down His life for us; and then each of us, as His commissioned messenger will speed forth on his course, mingling with men as a man and a brother, sharing their toils and their aspirations, sorrowing and rejoicing with their sorrows and joys, understanding their difficulties and pressing and panting on with them in their intellectual struggles, but bearing wherever he goes the fiery cross, telling in cottage and in castle, in kitchen and in drawing-room, in shop and in country house, in pulpit of church and in chamber of death, telling in simplicity and sincerity of heart the good news he has learned to prize as the great treasure of the heart, the good news as to the love and sympathy and pardon of the Lord Jesus.

Reviews and Notices.

THE MEMORIAL EDITION OF THE OXFORD BIBLE FOR TEACHERS. London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse, 7, Paternoster-row. New York: 42, Bleecker-street.

This being the centenary year of the institution of our Sunday Schools, we wish to say a few words about a special edition of *the Oxford Bible for Teachers* which has been brought out for the occasion, and which was presented by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the superintendents of each of the Sunday Schools that met together a short time ago at Lambeth Palace. This Bible, which has been published for some years now, though not in quite so complete a form as the edition we have just received, and is probably well known to clergymen, teachers, and others, is replete with useful information, necessary for the full examination, elucidation, and explanation of Holy Scripture. It comprises a complete copy of the Old and New Testaments with references, quite distinct from the appendix of "Helps to the Study of the Bible" at the end. This appendix contains:

1. Notes on the Old Testament comprising an explanation of the title of the Bible; the Hebrew division of the Bible into three parts, viz., "The Law," "the Prophets," and "the Scriptures;" the division of the English Bible into four parts, viz., the Pentateuch, the Historical Books, the Poetical Books, and the Prophetical Books, with an analysis and summary of each.
2. Next comes a brief historical summary of the interval between the Old and theNew Testaments.
3. A genealogical tree of the Herods.
4. A description of the peculiarities of the different sects and parties among the Jews.
5. A chronology of the Old Testament.
6. A chronology of the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles.
7. An Historical summary.
8. A complete list of the miracles and parables in the Old Testament, telling us by whom they were done or spoken, and where they are recorded.
9. A tale of the miracles and parables of our Lord, the locality in which the miracles were performed and

the parables told, the evangelists by whom they are recorded, and the lessons which the parables are intended to teach us.

10. A list of the names, titles, and offices of Christ, giving references for all of them.

11. The prophecies relating to Christ, showing where they are to be found, and how they were fulfilled.

12. The special prayers of different persons in the Bible, with their subjects, and the passages in which they are recorded.

13. Notes on the New Testament containing a brief notice of the early copies, a division of it into three parts, Constitutional and Historical, Didactic, and Prophectical, and an analysis and summary of each of the books.

14. A table showing the Harmony of the Gospels, the dates of the different events and where they took place.

15. A brief account of St. Paul's missionary journies, telling in whose company they were taken, and the chief things that took place at each city they visited.

16. A similar account of St. Paul's voyage to Rome.

17. A short geography and topography of Palestine.

18. The mountains mentioned in the Scripture with references and associations.

19. The rivers and lakes of Scripture giving their ancient and modern names, the countries in which they were situated, references to find where they are mentioned, and the events connected with each.

20. The Ethnology of Bible lands.

21. The animals mentioned in the Bible, giving their English, Hebrew, and Greek names and a short description of each.

22. A similar list of the trees, plants, and flowers of the Bible with their botanical names.

23. A short geology of Bible lands.

24. An account of music and musical instruments, which describes the stringed instruments, wind instruments, and the instruments of percussion.

25. A complete table of weights and measures, and Jewish and Roman monies.

26. The Jewish year, showing the months, with the number of days together with the vegetable products in each, and the Jewish Festivals.

27. Obsolete or Ambiguous words with an explanation of each.

28. Words used symbolically.

After all this useful information there are several blank pages left for manuscript notes, and then comes the Oxford Index to the Holy Scriptures, which appears to be a very correct one. Next we have the Oxford Concordance to the Old and New Testaments, which is based upon Cruden's Concordance and contains over 25,000 references to the more important passages of Holy Scripture. "The index and concordance," writes the Bishop of Oxford: "Will greatly help a thoughtful reader to obtain a knowledge of Holy Scripture in the highest sense by comparing Scripture with Scripture." There is also a dictionary of proper names found in the Bible with their pronunciations and meanings. This excellent appendix is prefaced by a full table of contents and concluded by a compact little Bible Atlas consisting of twelve coloured maps of different periods, very clear considering their size, and an index to facilitate the finding of the places. The only omission we notice, and that a great one, is an account of the diseases mentioned in the Bible. This book will be of the utmost assistance to teachers of Sunday-school classes, Bible classes, and all those students of the Bible who have not a large library to refer to. It will also be very useful to clergymen who constantly have to prepare sermons when away from home, and who of course cannot always carry about with them the pondrous volumes of their libraries, but who might always have this book at hand, the edition containing the Apocrypha and all the aforesaid information, in an excellent type being not too large to be carried in a small portmanteau; while there are several smaller editions, the smallest measuring only four inches by five and a-half. The Oxford Bible may be had at prices from 3s. to £1 16s., and so is within the reach of almost everyone. The additional matter index, concordance, maps, &c., may also be bought bound up separately, without the Bible text, for the small sum of one shilling.

We have given these details of this remarkable book in order that its excellence may be understood; otherwise the ordinary reader might imagine, as he first looks at the volume, that he has before him merely a reference Bible, with a concordance and a few maps at the end. Even so he will admire it as beautifully got up in every way—the model of a portable Concordance and Reference Bible.

"The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures." By the Very Rev. Daniel Bagot, D.D. London: Hatchards, Piccadilly. Pp. 79.

As a useful manual this volume may well be recommended to the notice of students interested in the important subject of which it treats. Well versed in various branches of theological science, the author has brought to the preparation of this treatise no ordinary amount of research. It consists of six parts—a definition of the meaning of the expressions. "The Canon of Scripture," and of the term "Inspiration," a classification of the channels through which the contents of the Bible have come—proofs of its Inspiration, answers to objections, and a practical application of the subject. The writer enumerates as follows: the principal channels through which the "*material*" contained in Holy Scripture has come, namely, *observation* by which personal knowledge was obtained as in the case of St. John the Evangelist, who wrote of that of which he had ocular proof. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life. . . . that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you." *Information*, or being made acquainted with facts by the testimony of credible witnesses. *Compilation*, or the process of deriving information from previously written documents. *Meditation*, or the exercise of the mind upon spiritual subjects. *Imagination*, or the power of illustrating divine truth by similes and metaphors. *Argumentation*, or the exercise of the reasoning faculty upon doctrinal and other subjects, and, finally, *Revelation*, or direct communication from the Almighty Himself. Passing on to notice various classes of objections against the Inspiration of the Bible, Dr. Bagot furnishes replies to those drawn from the errors and variations in manuscripts, from statements said to be opposed to scientific discoveries, from alleged contradictory statements, and from the varieties observable in the style of the writers. "I have no doubt," he observes, when noticing the objections based upon geological discovery, "that such discovery will ultimately be found not only not to contradict, but to correspond with the statements of Scripture." "In the meantime, this fascinating science is quite too young, and geologists may have been too hasty in deducing principles, and drawing general conclusions from an inadequate or inaccurate induction. On the other hand, commentators

may have given too premature and superficial interpretations of sacred Scripture, without taking advantage of the assistance which science is calculated to impart. To geology, even as far as it has made progress, we are much indebted, and quite ready to recognize it as a handmaid to revelation. It has solved may difficulties connected with the creation and past history of the globe on which we live, and, instead of its discoveries being opposed to statements in the Word of God, it has even already become a valuable auxiliary for explaining many things apparently anomalous and otherwise incredible which the Bible contains." The writer has ably shewn that it was no part of the divine purpose to convey scientific information, or to anticipate, in any measure, the philosophic discoveries of coming ages, for that would have been to forestall what is the legitimate province of the judgment, and the reasoning powers of man. Not the least interesting part of the treatise, is that in which it is shewn that the *discrepancies* found in Scripture, are not to be considered as *contradictions*. It is proved that discrepancies have even an evidential value, and that they prove the independent character of the accounts in which they are found. For example, the cases of the four Evangelists are adduced in evidence that they did not compose their respective narratives in collusion or upon a preconcerted plan, but as four distinct witnesses, putting upon record the essential transactions of the life of their Master. Two specimens of alleged contradictions are given, and it is proved, in each case, that the arguments based upon them have no validity whatever. First, as an instance of accounts, which are assumed by objectors to refer to the same occurrence, Dr. Bagot mentions those passages found in St. Matthew xxviii. 18-20, and in St. Mark xvi. 15-18. A record of the commission given by the Saviour to His Apostles before His Ascension is found at the close of the Gospel of the first Evangelist, in which there is no mention of a promise of miraculous endowments, and that record is compared, by objectors for the purpose of throwing discredit upon the statements of Scripture, with the account found in the Gospel of St. Mark in which it is stated that "signs should follow them that believe," such as the casting out of demons, the speaking with new tongues, the taking up of serpents, the drinking of what would otherwise be destructive of life without sustaining injury, and the cure of diseases by the laying on of hands. The incorrectness of the supposition that the statements have reference to the *same* circumstances is thus clearly shewn. The commission recorded by St. Matthew was given upon a mountain, and that recorded by St. Mark was give to the Eleven as they were sitting at a meal and was, moreover, prefaced by language reproaching those addressed, with their want of faith, because they did not credit the testimony of those who had seen the Lord after He had "burst the bands of death." Dr. Bagot distinguishes between what he designates the *permanent* commission referred to by St. Matthew, and the *temporary* commission recorded by St. Mark. The latter he shows to have been given to the Apostles *exclusively* as witnesses of the Resurrection, and that with a promise which was literally fulfilled, "The Lord working with them when they went forth, and confirming the word with signs following." Another objection, namely, that the Evangelists give different accounts of the inscription placed upon the Cross is shewn to be based upon a logical fallacy the nature of which is exposed in pages 66-67. In reply to the futile objection that all the Books of Scripture could not have been written under the guidance or superintendence of the Holy Spirit, the writer shews that it is thoroughly in accordance with a correct view of inspiration that men of various talents and habits of thought should have been employed in the sacred work. They were not made use of by the Divine Spirit as so many unconscious channels for the conveyance of truth; but employed as sentient, rational beings, heavenly powers stimulating their faculties, operating upon their memory, their judgment, their powers of observation and reasoning. Dr. Bagot has been careful not to conclude without reference to that invaluable evidence which the pious and devout student of the "oracles of God" can have of their Divine origin and authority. "Just in proportion," he says, "as we progressively acquire a sanctifying and experimental knowledge of that Saviour of whom the Bible testifies, shall we become more and more rooted in a solid conviction and an inward consciousness that the Holy Scriptures are really in truth the inspired Word of God. If any man will (is willing) to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God. He shall have an *internal* evidence growing with his growth in Grace." The Appendix on 2nd Timothy iii. 15—17 forms a suitable addition to this valuable treatise well deserving of attentive perusal.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CONTINUOUS LIFE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Mr. Thring's sermon is *most useful*. I am sure such things ought to be brought before adolescents more than they are, with deep seriousness and great plainness of speech There is a passage in Rousseau's "Emile," which I cannot quote, forcibly advocating plain out-spokenness on a kindred subject.

August 9, 1880. C. P. R.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barry, Rev. D. T., late secretary C.M.S., at Madras and Calcutta, and formerly incumbent of St. Barnabas', Liverpool, and of St. Anne's, Birkenhead; rectory of Fishley, Norwich.

Bennett, Rev. Theophilus, vicar of Brownsea Island, Dorset; chaplain to the Coast Guard, Poole Harbour.

Blythe. Rev. Edward Hamilton, vicar of Margate, Kent.

Claughton, Rev. Thomas Leigh, vicar of St. Mary, Kidderminster.

Coxe, Rev. Hilgrove, vicar of Pyrton, Oxon.

Coar, Rev. C. J. principal chaplain head quarters eastern districts at Colchester.

Cousens, Rev. E. H. F., perpetual curate of Holy Trinity, Tewkesbury.

Craig, Rev. H. Tudor, principal chaplain to the Forces at Colchester; chaplain to the Forces at Winchester.

Fountaine, Rev. Henry Thomas, curate at Bulwell, Notts; vicar of St. Matthew, Sutton Bridge, Lincolnshire.

Gregory, Rev. John, curate of St. Mark's, Leicester; vicar of St. Mary's, Far Cotton, Northampton.

Hardy, Rev. Charles Robert William, vicar of St. Margaret, Underriver, Kent.

Haslam, Rev. John Horsley, vicar of St. Matthias, Birmingham.

Jaquet, Rev. James Henry, vicar of Tilmanstone, Kent.

Lambert, Rev. Brooke, late vicar of Tamworth; vicar of Greenwich.

Leigh, Rev. Walter, curate of Aston Eqiscopi and Broughton Hackett.

Lindsay, Rev. John, incumbent of St. Mary's Dunkeld; incumbent of St. John the Baptist, West Derby, near Liverpool.

Pearson, Rev. Alleyn Ward, rector of St. Margaret, Canterbury.

Snell, Rev. A., vicar of Witham and rural dean; honorary canon of St. Alban's.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE RECEPTION OF BRADLAUGH INTO PARLIAMENT.

By the Rev. W. B. PHILPOT, M.A.,
Vicar of South Bersted, Bognor.

Sermon Preached at South Bersted on Sunday, July 4th, 1880.

"He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house."—2 John 9-10.

(Continued from page 389.)

THIS man says of himself that he could not choose his opinions, but that he grew into them If, however, anyone eats bad food or none, his body suffers; if he chooses wrong mental food or takes none his mind suffers. So surely if a man ignore his higher life, does not take food convenient for it, reads the Bible merely as a carping critic—if at all—cuts off the channel of Divine nutriants from his spirit, then also by the same rule his spirit is bound to starve, and his best faculties to run to waste and die. It is a man's own fault, generally speaking, in a Christian country, if he loses the faculty of faith; and it occurs to me that, at least according to the ideal standard of things, it is to be lamented that any man should be chosen to represent a constituency in a Christian country who is palpably defective in the characteristics of advanced manhood. But this they willingly are ignorant of, while they blind themselves to the truth in the combat which is so rapidly deepening between God and His enemies.

But what a singular perversion of language it is to call the opinions of such men, and many others, "advanced!" There is a sad and curious prostitution of our mother-tongue in this word, which is now so commonly used of any unusual folly or any marked extravagance. If a man nowadays goes beyond his fellows in any line of stupidity, if he apes the airs of any effete superstition to an extent which no sober-minded man would dare to do, he calls himself, and his dupes call him, "advanced" and "high!" And so in politics, when any mountebank leaps beyond all the bounds of decency, and trangresses all the received limits of moderation—if, like that tribe of Scythians, he shoots arrows at the thunderstorm, and lifts up his voice against the order of the commonwealth, and the reverence due to God and the Queen—he calls himself, and his clique call him, "advanced!" Instead of calling such men "unfortunate" and "advanced," let them be called by their right names. Let them be styled culpable; let them be noted as retrogade; let them be regarded as self-degraded.

Let me now give you a few words both of comfort and of caution. I know not by what arts this man may have persuaded the men of Northampton to send him to be received into our House. I would fain hope that it is not *by reason* of his avowed Godlessness that they have sent him, but by reason mainly of his supposed advocacy of what is called political freedom. But let no one suppose that either all those who take his cause in the nation, or who have voted that he should be received into our House, have done so from sympathy with his irreligion. For example, many of these labourers in their "Chronicle" have distinctly disclaimed this, but have openly based their advocacy of his cause on the constitutional ground that, having been chosen by the people, he must, however lamentable they regard his avowed views, be allowed to sit in the people's Parliament. It seems to have been felt, and therein I suppose it is common-sense to agree with them, that, apart from the question of his mode of treating Parliamentary forms, and apart from the status to which the judicial condemnation of his books has reduced him, either of which aspects might perhaps have excluded this particular man, it was not worth while, out of sympathy for the past, and from love of a standard which we had lost, to preserve any longer the sorry rag which was left to Parliament of the raiment of Godliness—that shred of profession which had been left by a succession of necessary concessions. Still, it was to be expected, and was surely seemly that our national avowal of God should not be let go without some such struggle to keep this Holy Name among us. As for the speeches and the votes, probably the right thing in this remarkable conjuncture was to say one thing and vote for another.

At the same time, I do not envy the feelings of those men who, being themselves religious, have by their incessant clamours, brought England to this depth of humiliation. Little did the pious member of the Society of Friends (as if, by the way, all Christendom were not a Society of Friends!) or the reverential Roman Catholic, or the solemn Jew, or the religious Nonconformist think whereto this would grow. Perhaps had they foreseen this, they would have rather forced their good conscience a few years ago to bow themselves a little in what they regarded as "The House of Rimmon." But this is what they have brought us to, and it is they whom we have to thank for it. But a still greater remorse will await them when they have cut out the spirit of the Church from the body of the State, and when they see the consequences of their vivisection. Their work will then be done. When they find the carcase of their mother cast outside the House, they will then have nothing more that they can do. It will, however, be the State which will be left. We have truly in our political life set ourselves in no good way. We are tied and bound by the bands of our old sins. We are now reaping in the manhood of our nation the neglects of our youth. The fact that dissent—religious dissent—

should have sprung up is now found to be the least of the evils sown in her field while the National Church was sleeping. In this effect there was indeed something inartistic, something which spoiled the beautiful picture of a nation in its highest acts at unity with itself. Yet, If thus alone the Church was to be roused, and Christianity, in whatever form, was to be kept in England, dissent—religious dissent, however devoid of culture—was surely to be counted a blessing and a compensation. In so far forth, as these religious anomalies are due to political revenges, there would seem to be a dramatic propriety in the losses and humiliation of the nation and its Church.

But however this may be, we have now to confront the larger calamities which have sprung from that faultful past. We have awoke indeed, but it is to gaze with dismay at worse tares sown by all kinds of enemies while we slept. The church finds the whole nation, as a national organism, slipped away from the control of her spirit. How could it be otherwise? Was it to be expected that generations of untaught and uncared-for masses were to produce the population which we see around us of a temper gentle, easy to be entreated, and ready to her hand for the uses of God and of the State? Not only the population but the mind of the nation has been growing. Freedom has been marching with strides more rapid than religion. The soul of the land has lagged sadly behind the mind of the land, the lower nature has out-grown its higher. Yet the godless must be governed, as they must be buried. Nay they must, in this phase of free institutions, subject at present to constitutional limits, govern themselves. As they insist on being buried in what place and way they like, and even, if so it please them, without any *post mortem* credit for faith, so they now insist on living without any formal credit for faith, and on governing themselves without any recognition of it. Well: England has bred them to be what they are, and she must take the consequences, be what they may. She must make the best of her own failures, as parents have to do with their spoiled children; an imperfect nation cannot any longer have forced upon it a perfect ideal. Corruption has set in upon the national organism. The Church of the nation was first given up mainly by reason of her own narrowness, as a test of legislative fitness; then Christ Himself went; now God the Father has gone, and it is obvious that a day may come when the Speaker will have to call to order any appeal to conscience which these "advanced" thinkers regard as an effete remnant of national religion which they consider also to have gone.

Already the leader of Nonconformist religion in the Lower House has stated that a conscience without God is as good as the conscience of a man who believes in God; and has stated that he makes no reference to God in his own affirmation. Now if this merely meant that he makes no *express* reference to God, his argument is destroyed by his meaning that he makes a tacit one. If he means, as he seems to do, that he makes no reference at all, then I say, that this is the most astounding confession which was ever made by a religious public man. If a legislator admits that in entering upon his work as a maker of laws he, while believing in God discards God from his legislative conscience and discharges the sense of the presence of the source of Law from all the law-making which he is elected to do for his country, this is certainly a novel conception of the uses of religion, and one from which the whole sense of Christendom must recoil. It is the main comfort of our common faith that in Him we live and move, which, I presume, includes the moving of resolutions. The Quaker was by common understanding admitted to affirm solely because of some verbal difficulty as to taking the name of God, and because an eccentric but quiet community opined that it was as wrong to take the Holy name in verity, as to take it in vain; the House thinking more of the Quaker than of the Quaker's God, and little thinking that this door, thus set ajar, would let in the flagrant Atheist, took it for granted that the Friend was at least so far a friend of a legislative God that his affirmation included a tacit acknowledgement of that God for the uses of the State, but now it turns out that that affirmation has no inward reference to God at all, and that the remission of the sacred form, made in the case of the Society of Friends, is claimed by the modern spokesman of that Society as affording a cover for the admission of the openly and avowedly Godless. Surely that member of the Society of Friends who, whatever private functions he may select for God, makes no reference to the source of Truth and Light and Right Judgment in his deliberations for his countrymen, is a questionable friend of society. This public avowal shows, I may add, what is to be looked for by the kingdom of God and the Church of Christ from that Nonconformist faith which at such a hinge of affairs has thus already stood apart from God in the English House of Representatives. It is strange and, to those who look to find a perfect nation come out from the old lines of European and British ecclesiastical history it might seem hopeless to find that Christianity has brought this its favoured home to a national level far, far below that which was attained in States by the first Adamic species under its natural religion. To pass by the wisdom of Egyptians, from whom Moses learned, "I am that I am," look briefly at the simple beauty of the religion which Virgil represents Æneas to have found at the Court of King Latinus, a court the more interesting from its locality being that of the future Empire, and the future Church of Rome. If the story did spring without much root of traditionary fact from the imagination of the poet; it shows us at any rate what a pre-Christian genius and the guide of Dante felt to lie in the possibilities of the earlier past. He draws a picture of a heathen state, a state without even the benefit of such revelation as was vouchsafed to that Semitic race, in the line of whose stem

Humanity was to flower in the Son of God. I am tempted to give you the whole story, but you will find it in the seventh book of the Æneid. The coming of the Trojan strangers, you will some of you remember, surprised the youth of the Latin nation as they were engaged in martial exercise. One of these youths, as became him, rode at full speed to tell their prophet, their priest, and their king. Latinus, in no alarm, but in full reliance on the guidance of heaven, summoned to his presence the heroic estrays of the fallen Troy, and sat to receive them on the throne of his ancestors. The palace in which he welcomed them was a vast and august mansion, standing on a rising ground, supported by a hundred columns, hardly less grand, it would seem, than our palace at Westminster, in the precincts of its Abbey. The sanctity of the place was enhanced, it was said, by the mysterious gloom of the mighty woods which encompassed it, and by the associations of an ancestry reaching back, as they believed, into sources which were Divine. Their Temple was the scene of their feasts, for their very feasts were sacred. Whatsoever they did, whether they ate or drank—not at particular times, but always—they did it to the glory of their God. Church and State were naturally in one, and their refreshment—if I may carry back these words to those times—their very conviviality, was sacramental. *Hœ sacris sedes epulis.* The Houses of Lords and Commons in one, the gathered company of their old men, were wont to feast there off the flesh of sacred rams at a long Board, and round them, carved in cedar, were the effigies of their departed kings. They appear to have had no religious difficulty, nor any question of "local option," for in the entrance-hall stood the images of the first planter of the vine, with a symbolic sickle in his hand, and of the Father of the gods. Also the War-god was there with two faces, looking one for the deeds of war and the other for the works of peace. To show that this established State, with its established Church, had reached its tranquil era through no untroubled history, there were also many statues of old kings who had bled and died for their country: on the door-posts, and from the holy pillars there hung battered armour and disused weapons of the past, shields, spears, horse-hair crests of old-fashioned helmets, chariots taken in land-fights, the beaks of vessels captured in sea-fights, and mighty bolts wrenched off the gates of cities which they had stormed. Such was the palace-hall and such the Cathedral in which old Latinus sat, sceptre in hand, when he summoned those strangers, the waifs and strays of Troy, the early colonists and fathers of the Roman Empire, into his august presence. When they had been ushered in by the youths aforesaid, whose martial games had been checked by the portent of their arrival, he addressed them with the calm dignity which became so mighty and firmly-seated a monarch. "Sons of Troy," he said, "for think not that your city and your story is unknown to us, say what is it that you seek? What reason has brought you through so many waves to our shore? Have ye lost your way, and are ye driven hither by the storms; for men that fare on the sea have many such chances to run? Ye have come up our river, and, it seems, are settling in our haven. No uncouth people are we who dislike you because ye are strangers. Let me tell you at once that ye need not fear us. We are the Latins, and we are God's people, and we are just, and fair, and walk in the ways of righteousness, not under constraint of any laws, but of our own free will and natural desire we follow the guidance of Heaven."

Well, such is the picture which I said I would draw for you from history and from the account of the great poet Virgil, of the old ideal of a pre-Christian State under natural religion. Now, I would ask you, is not that a state of things before which the Parliament and people of England, who have professed to be guided by the Son of God for above 1,000 years, may well feel itself abashed?—a people whose Parliament, in this present year of grace, and in the present week, have, in virtue of their very growth in freedom, banished the last token of the presence of God from the form with which they receive members into their House. How would a Bradlaugh have stood before the State and Council of Latinus? Had such a man, without any god at all, ventured to ask leave to take part in the deliberations of that venerable people, had he said, as he has said to England, "I cannot choose, and have not chosen, my opinions; I have grown into them;" Latinus, who was it appears his own Prime Minister, would have said "Man, I understand not what thou sayest. Surely thou art no Latin; nor do I think that thou art a full-grown man. Thou hast a terrible organic defect in thy nature, which must exclude thee for ever from our council-table and from our State;" and he would straightway have bidden the young men who brought him thither to convey him thence, that the winds which bore him thither might blow him back to the strange and defective race in which it was possible for a man to have grown down into the ignorance of God.

Look once more at that other great people, the Greeks, also a pre-Christian and non-Jewish nation, to whom the race of man owes so much of its culture, for that was the part of the stem along which in them the human plant long up-ran, just as to the Latins we mainly owe the knotty joint of human law. Herein let me choose for you one chorus, or holy song, in the Antigone of Sophocles, one, so to speak, of their canonical prophets. This song, as far as the idea goes, might have been conceived by any observant child first opening the eyes of his soul upon the world in which he finds himself, while the language could only be the outpouring of a poetic spirit, rare and practised, and using all the weapons of words and without knowing it all the secrets of art. The thought of Antigone leads the chorus at once to the thought of her father Œdipus, and to that riddle, the great riddle of Man,

by solving which he had saved his country and lost himself. It was a riddle to which the Theban king had only added a fresh and terrible entanglement, and which our Christ alone, the God-man was destined rightly to unravel. Man, who by the original game-license of Eden, inherits dominion over the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and the fish of the sea, over disease itself, and over all things but death, finds himself the victim of forces which he cannot control; and mere ignorance makes the best of men the sport, it seems, of the worst disaster. Having pondered man in his early uncultured and gregarious state, the teacher comes to think of him as a sower, a plougher, and then as a citizen. A possessor of thought and voice, he begins to mould society into manners. But, adds the poet with a truth which is not Greek alone but is eternal, man foregoes his high name of citizen when that which is evil is present with him. Then only can he rightly be named a high-souled citizen, when he binds together the laws of his native land by righteousness, when he brings God into a form of words, and when he owns *the validity of an oath*. If an ancient Greek could regard his word as good as his oath, it would only be because his word like his oath had God in it, So that we see under "natural religion," the great and cultured mind of Greece, like that of the higher Jew, held the taking of the name of God in the solemn duties of a citizen, to be a sign and token of truth bound up with the deepest consciousness of his position as a man.

Alas, my brethren and fellow-countrymen, what a sad contrast to the pure aspiration of natural religion, both in Rome and Greece, is now set forth in our House of Representatives, which is the very cream of our English citizenship, by what I must call its un-natural irreligion! Here in civilized England, in the close of the Nineteenth Century of Grace, that which has been regarded in pre-Christian Empires, as well as all Christian States, as the deepest and most inviolable bond of all the sacred past, the Name of God, has been rudely and violently undone. Sad indeed is the immediate prospect of the truth among us, seeing that, by a majority, it has been pronounced to be thus separable from the God of Truth. And the matter is not mended when we feel, as we must, that upon the line of licence to which our national constitution has long committed itself, this separation was necessary. The steeds are racing down-hill, and the reins are being thrown upon their necks. May we not well exclaim with the prophet, though with a converse significance, "The chariots of England and the horsemen thereof!" We have handed ourselves over to forces, which can thus already for a time destroy legislative Godliness, and which must end in the ruin, I do not say of National Christianity, but of national and natural religion. I say for a time, for let no man suppose that this is to be the *denouement* and final catastrophe of English Christianity. The course which lies before our country will be this: let me advertise to you in a few words what must come to pass. I have glanced at it by anticipation.

Our beloved State must run, she is bound I say to run upon the line of country which she has marked out for herself, and to run, I fear, till she drops. There is no present discharge from that obligation, except indeed men wake up and shake off before it is too late by some gigantic and unlooked-for effort the trifling and illusion by which we see them at present to be mastered. This will not be done by any unscientific exclusion of Godless and Christless men from our House. I take it that we shall first be called upon to learn by bitter experience the ruin consequent upon Godless Government. The principle of toleration which excludes God from the House, which is the public school of men, must soon exclude Him from the public schools of children. These, trained out of the knowledge of God, will soon, very soon, be the voters, and thus the masters and governors, of England. It were long and sad to trace, but easy, alas, to foresee, what a change this will make in the details of our national life. The principles of Christ are those which alone lie at the root of conduct and content. These will be gone, for it is ridiculous to suppose that the random efforts of sects, of which the Church will only be one, to teach them in an hour and a half of the Day of rest, if to us that Day of rest will be left, will serve to keep national conduct wholesome and right. Sunday Schools, to which there is no compulson, will draw but a few children, who all the week have been taught aversion to their God, under the high authority of the State and Queen. Into all the questions of conscience, as it is grotesquely called, they cannot enter. The proximate masters of England will grow up, or rather grow down, without God in their world. The code of morals contained in the duty to God and our Neighbour will be forgotten; or if in some form the latter will be taught, it will be based on an authority which must fail to fill the place of the religious sense in the national soul, which soul, from want of energizing its faculties in social life will speedily die out. The region in which resides national conscience and individual principle will be gone. Earthly codes, the only code left, will not touch the anti-family vices, there will be nothing left to control common inpulse, and the population will sink to the level of beasts "possessed." It will not be long before the whole herd will rush violently down the steep places of sin, and perish in the revolutionary abyss.

This being our prospect at no great distance of time, how, you will ask, is the kingdom of God eventually to come?

On this wise. Men will before very long begin to cast about for a remedy. It will be seen by the very masses, who are, after all "English natures, freemen souls," that the heart and kernel of conservation remains with those of their fellow citizens who are Christians. Those in their unpublic way will be

seen to have made marked advance, the more so because they will have retired into a splendid contrast. Their isolated polity set on a hill cannot be hid. The best of the Christian sects, notably the ancient Church (though the name of England will probably, if possible, have been taken from her) will let it be seen that in the teaching of Christ they alone possess the secret of national salvation. It will then, in the search for a remedy for national evil, come to be demanded, and the energy of surviving Christianity will all along make effectual fervent efforts to this end, how the principles of the higher type can be brought to bear upon the conduct of their country. Then some day, when the hour is ripe, either a Royal, or Presidential, or it may be even a Communistic Commission will, with nervous anxiety, be issued to enquire what there is to be found which may be useful and generally necessary to National Life in the old teachings of the half-forgotten Christ. The sooner, let me say, some such course is taken by ourselves in our own historic juncture the better chance we shall have of providing a substantial Christianity, and the better shall we be able to meet impending perils. The result, however, whenever this is done, is that some rough code of public Christian morals, better than none, will be arrived at and acted upon. This will be most imperative in all the elementary schools of the day, gentle and simple. Then at last will begin again to grow up a nation with a lively, bright, and steady hope. For the more that half-heathen people come to feel, with something of the charm of novelty, the solid comfort of the indwelling Spirit of Jesus, the more they will yearn to know. The meagre divinity granted at first by trembling and incredulous statesmen will put the people of successive generations upon the track of further quest. To that end they will fall into the gospel-nets of the thousand and one sects into which religion will be split, and those will prosper most which most commend themselves to be in keeping with what the schools have taught. Then let a minister of our own beloved Church express a humble belief that she will re-gather, with most paramount success, the souls that she had lost, and will come, with splendid triumph, to the rescue of our country. Thus, by due degrees, the Truth in the Scriptures, the Truth as it is in Jesus, will be again believed and loved. The people, with fresh delight, will recognise their Saviour, and the Mother-Church who has kept Him for them. England will then erelong grow up into Christ in all things, and—oh! blessed resolve—will say, "Lord, to Whom shall we go? Thou only hast the words of eternal life and saving health. We will never leave Thee again."

But the time of figs is not yet. And—oh dreadful possibility—the fig-tree of England, cumbering the ground, may be cut down before the time arrives. For, between this present and that future which I have so roughly sketched, who can say what may not happen? The nation that forsakes its ideal will only find it again through much tribulation. Yet pray God that the many righteous men and women found in our land may arrest the natural penalty of destruction.

Meanwhile, dear brethren, let us, for our own single parts, take infinite care, first of all to receive the spirit of Jesus into the house of our hearts. And, next, let us take no less heed to send men of the right sort into our National Assembly—men whom no non-conformist member can charge with disregard of the Presence of God and the value of an oath. For remember that, as things now are, whomsoever any constituencies of reckless or evil mind may choose to send up to represent them will most surely be received into that House.

RELIGION IN EVERY-DAY LIFE.

By the Rev. J. VAUGHAN, B.A.

Sermon Preached at Haselbury Church, June 6th, 1880.

"I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil."—John xvii. 15.

THESE words are part of that great prayer of Christ's which He offered to His Father the night that He was betrayed. He had already eaten that Last Supper with His disciples (which we commemorated here this morning), and the traitor, Judas, had already gone forth into the night. And directly he was gone our Lord spoke to His disciples that grand and beautiful discourse,* which the evangelist, St. John, has preserved to us. It was then that He spoke those comforting words which have cheered many a weary soul on a bed of languishing, those words beginning—"Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe in God, believe also in Me." It was then that He spoke the noble parable of the True Vine, and gave to His disciples the chief commandment of love. It was then that He spoke to them of "The Holy Ghost, the Comforter," who would help them when He was gone. It was then that He told them that here on earth they would suffer tribulation, as we know they did suffer it, but bid them be of good cheer, for He had overcome the world. And then, looking up to heaven, He prayed to His Father for those loved ones who had followed Him on earth, not that they should be taken out of the world, but that they should be kept from the evil of the world. And having ended that Divine prayer, He went forth with His disciples over the brook, Kedron, and entered the dark shadows of the garden of Gethsemane.

I. My friends, I wish to speak to you this afternoon about those few words which I have taken from that prayer of Christ's: "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil."

* John xiv., xv., xvi.

They are the words of the greatest man that ever lived—of the founder of our religion, even of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. They were spoken the night before His death, concerning His followers on earth; and I presume He knew what He was saying.

But those words are not what many persons would have expected. They would fancy that our Lord's prayer would have been rather after this fashion: "I pray that Thou *shouldest* take them out of the world, that they *may* be kept from the evil." But so prayed not Christ. Such persons would fancy that our Lord would rather have bid His followers to retire into the desert, and there, amid the solitudes of nature, to meditate on spiritual things, and to prepare their souls for heaven. But so commanded not Christ.

But even if Christ had so ordered it; even if Christ had commanded His followers to leave the world—the world of life and business and pleasure, and to take up their abode in some solitary wilderness away from their fellow men, there would have been little to wonder at; for the times in which Christ and His apostles lived were bad and evil times. The night of Paganism was at its darkest. The corruptions of the great Roman Empire were at their worst. The picture of society, as given by heathen writers,* is too revolting to look upon. then, I say, our Lord had commanded His disciples to retire from their glaring scene of crime and shame there would have been little to wonder at. But he did not. And we cannot be thankful enough that He did not. We cannot be thankful enough that Christ came, not to call men out of the world, but to teach them how to live in the world; not to proscribe work and business as irreligious, but to sanctify it and to ennoble it.

II. And this is what Christ did by His example and by His words, during His whole life on earth. He never, by any act of His, gave encouragement to those who would separate religion from the common acts of daily life. For how, think you, my friends, did Christ spend those thirty years before He was baptized of John in Jordan? Of those thirty years very little is told us. From the retirement of Nazareth to the baptism in Jordan nothing is directly told us, save that one story of Christ going up to Jerusalem when twelve years old, and waiting behind in the Temple to listen to the doctors, and to ask them questions. Do we, then, know nothing of those eighteen years which passed between His staying behind in the Temple, and His baptism in Jordan? Yes, thank God we do. St. Mark has preserved to us one word, but that word is sufficient. Let us be thankful that no so-called pious fraud has removed that word from the Gospel; for this word is ὁ τέκτων, "the carpenter."* For now we know how Christ spent His time before He began His ministry; that He spent it not away from His fellow-men in some desolate retirement in some lonely wilderness but that He worked, as other men work, with His own hands, as a carpenter in the village of Nazareth. And there is nothing derogatory, nothing lowering in the fact that Christ did work, as some persons are apt to suppose; but there is something ennobling and elevating. For Christ came, not to call men out of the world, but to teach them to live honourably and nobly in the world; and so Christ worked with His own hands, that mankind might know that He, the Son of God, was not above manual labour, and might know, too, that there is nothing in His religion that necessitates retirement from the world.

And when those thirty years were run, and Christ began His ministry, was there anything in His life and teaching which would lead men to fancy that if they would follow Christ's religion they must thenceforth bid the world good-bye? There was nothing. What life could be less like the dreamy ascetic than the life that Christ then lived? It was a life of continual toil, of ceaseless activity, of untiring love. He was ever to be found amid the busy haunts of men in the market-place, in the synagogue, beside the crystal lake, wherever people were gathered together He was to be found at the wedding feast, at the rich man's banquet, at the sufferer's couch, at the silent grave. Wherever good was to be done, wherever suffering was to be assuaged, there was Christ to do his Father's will. Yes, Christ by His example taught us that if we would live Christain lives we must live useful ones; if we would follow Him and His religion we must not take ourselves out of the world, but do our duty in the world. And the same lesson did Christ teach us by His words. Take those parables of His, by which He so often taught the people. Are not they lessons drawn from the daily lives and the daily occupations of men? Are not they pictures of man's industry in the world— the parables of the sower, the talents, the fishing-net, the labourers in the vineyard, the lost sheep, and many a noble story more? Yes; Christ drew pictures from the every-day work of men, and taught them how they might thereby serve their Father in heaven. Take, too, that noble sermon, the grandest that ever was preached—"The Sermon on the Mount," read it attentively, and tell me, are gloomy views of religion, are the doctrines of the hermit taught there? No. Christ spoke of the flowers of the field, and the birds of the air, and bid men learn from them the likeness of their Father in heaven. He there spoke to men living in the world, and taught them their duty to God and to their fellows.

III. But, alas! many persons, and many religious teachers, have fancied that they knew better than Christ, and, therefore, they have

* Juvenal, Martial, Suetonius, &c.

"The night was darkest before the dawn."† If

† Charles Kingsley.

* Mark vi. 3.

devised systems of religion, and of religious teaching, utterly alien to the simple teaching of Jesus? For what can be more opposite to the life of Christ than the life of the hermit and the recluse? What can be more contrary to the whole teaching of Jesus than the system of "religious houses" which seems to be becoming fashionable in these days? "I pray not that Thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldst keep them from the evil." So prayed Christ. And if, in order to be kept from the evil, it were necessary to leave the world, we may be quite sure that Christ would never have prayed those words. The inmates of such houses are, no doubt whatever, very self-denying and very religious. Their time may be spent in religious exercises and spiritual meditation. But "the end of man is an action, and not a thought, though it were the noblest."* Man was sent into the world for something else than spiritual meditation. Man was sent into the world for something else than the mere saving of his soul. He was sent into the world to work—to be of use to his fellow men in that station of life where God has placed him, and the more he follows his Master's example, and the more he listens to his Master's words, the better will he do his duty to man, and, therefore, to God likewise.

IV. Then, my friends, never get to think that your work, whatever it may be, need be a hindrance to your religious life, It ought to be a help to you, and not a hindrance. And it will be a help to you, if only you bear in mind that by doing your duty faithfully, you are serving Him who said of old, "Whatsoever† thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might." And never get to fancy that if you only happened to be in a higher station of life, and had less work to do, you would find it so much easier to do your duty, and to be religious. For it is not so. Every station of life has its temptations. It requires just as much grace to serve God as a rich landowner as it does as a poor labourer. And so you would find out. Every man be he rich or poor—has a duty to do, and woe be to him if he neglects it. For whosoever neglects his duty—be he rich or poor—is sinning against God and his fellowmen. And whosoever is doing his duty faithfully, honestly, and well, not with eye-service, as mere men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart as unto the Lord, is thereby doing the will of His Father which is in heaven.

And in work there is nothing common, nothing dishonourable. Some persons, I know, fancy that idleness is the mark of a gentleman. But such persons are altogether mistaken. Idleness is the mark, not a gentleman, but of a wasted and degraded life, Then, my friends, look upon your work as honourable, and sent of God, and as a means whereby you can serve both God and man. Remember that Christ has sanctified all labour—manual or otherwise—by working as a carpenter at Nazareth, and by going about doing good; and try to follow his example if you would be kept from the evil of the world. For an idle man, as all the world knows, is certain to get into trouble sooner or later. And therefore look upon your work as a blessing, and not merely as a something which must be got through somehow.

> "Do thy duty, that is best;
> Leave unto thy Lord the rest,"

knowing that that duty of thine is given thee of God; knowing that nothing is too small or insignificant for a Father's notice; knowing, as Christ said of old, that even a word of kindness, or cup of cold water, shall not loss its reward.

Do thy duty then to God, to thyself, and to thy fellows, and listen to thy Saviour's voice, speaking to thee amid the rush of business and the work of life, and saying:—

> "Whatsoever thing thou doest,
> To the least of thine and lowest,
> *That* thou doest unto Me."

* T. Carlyle, "Sartor Resartus," p, 109,
† Eccl. ix 10.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 21, 1880.

OUR correspondent "R. G." doubts whether Circumcision can be so useful in preserving the health of the bodies, and consequently that of the souls, of men as we seem to imagine. He does not controvert the facts and authorities on which we grounded our opinion. But asks, "if it is an operation so beneficial to the body, and tends to prevent the sins of impurity, how is it that St. Paul did not urge its adoption, instead of denouncing it as a religious rite worse than useless?" No doubt St. Paul's teaching is, *primâ facie*, a powerful argument against the operation; but it should be borne in mind that St. Paul was vehemently attacked on this very question, and had to defend himself against Judaizing Christians, which

may account for the warmth, if not the exaggeration, of his language, and certainly the case of Timothy shews that his practice was not always in accordance with his teaching. St. Paul was a devoted and enthusiastic preacher, whose one object it was to disseminate the new Religion amongst the Gentiles, and in order the better to succeed may he not have been led, even under inspiration, to give up and disparage the painful initiatory rite of the old Jewish Dispensation? Had he prescribed Circumcision rather than marriage to adult gentile Christians, he would have been unpractical, and "like one beating the air." St. Paul was human and fallible, and inasmuch as it is difficult to believe that he was led by inspiration to quarrel with Barnabas and Peter, may there not be some parts in his teaching which it is not obligatory, or even expedient, for us to follow. Certainly we do not act up to his saying and example, "I count all things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord." If we did we should utterly neglect our duties as individual citizens. If this great, enthusiastic, and most successful preacher is not to be imitated and implicitly obeyed in one item of his teaching, the question arises, how far are we justified in following his teaching rather than the "everlasting" covenant of God, "Whose gifts and callings are without retractation," and the example and teaching of our Blessed Saviour, Who doubtless assisted at many a Circumcision, and Who expressly cautions us, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" on the question of Circumcision? Inasmuch as the greater portion of Christ's public ministry was assigned to cleansing lepers and healing the sick, we cannot doubt but that any means of improving the bodily health and preventing disease would be pleasing to Him. Can we do wrong in imitating Christ in the matter of Circumcision? This, we venture to think, is a question deserving the deepest attention of theologians, especially because experience tends to prove that the operation *per se* prevents the most destructive as well as other diseases, and increases the health and strength of our bodies, and by consequence of our minds also. Bodily Life, as Mr. Thring recently shewed in his admirable sermon, is "Continuous Life," and the increments or diminishments of health, as well as the various taints of disease acquired by any tenant for life, whether husband or wife (who in this matter are verily and indeed one flesh), are continued in the offspring for several generations, and the same rule applies to the moral faculties, inasmuch as they greatly depend on the material organism. In reply to "C. P. C's" letter, we were sorry he was unable to follow our remarks of August 7th, we endeavoured to be as intelligible as possible, but, may be, he means that he does not agree with them. In speaking of Turks, we restricted our meaning to the Mahometan subjects of the Ottoman Empire. We have had no personal experience of any other of the numerous peoples, as Arabs, Egyptians, Moors, &c., who profess the Mahomedan religion. It would be as unfair to guage the moral character of the Turk by that of the Arab or Egyptian, as it would be to judge of the honesty and truth of an Englishman, but that of a Greek or Russian because they had professed Christianity. We used the word morality in its fullest and widest sense, and wished it tested by the observance of all the Ten Commandments, and not as "C. P. C." seems to mean by only one. We do not believe that Circumcision *per se* lessens sexual desire in the smallest degree, btt as we wrote, "by improving the muscular fibre and moral tone, it tends to give a man greater control over his necessary appetites and passions." Of the numerous races, and peoples professing the Mahomedan Faith, there are doubtless many in which sexual vices abound, but they abound to a greater extent in most Christian countries.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CIRCUMCISION.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—If Circumcision is beneficial to the body, and if it tends to prevent sins of impurity, how is it that St. Paul, a master teacher of purity, well acquainted with Circumcision, even when instructing Gentile Christians that as a religious rite it was worse than useless for them, did not urge its adoption as a most useful help in guarding against such sins?

St. Paul, who enjoins marriage as one remedy against sin, would surely have enjoined Circumcision also if conducive to purity. That he did not enjoin it, leads me to think it can scarcely be as beneficial as its advocate in your paper imagines.

Yours faithfully, R. G.

———o———

Sir,—I heartily second "C. P. R's" letter to you, in approval of Mr. Thring's sermon. I cannot however quite follow your leading article of August 7th, on "C. R's" letter.

The important question raised by him is, "Does Circumsion lessen in the male violent sexual desire?" Your article affirms that Turks and Jews are, as a people, more moral than Christians!

I do not quite know whether by "Turk," Mahometan is meant; or whether under Mahometan is included the queerly-believing Arab! Nor do I quite gather what is the *extent* of "sins of impurity in boyhood!"

I can't believe however that anyone, acquainted with the habits of the Mahometans of Egypt, or with the Arabs as seen in the interior of their own country, or who has *read* Lane's or Palgrave's descriptions of their customs and domestic institutions, would be satisfied with the assertion about Mahometan or Turkish morality. As to the Jews and their perpetual tendency to fornication and other vices, I fancy the Bible, together with the careful legislation of "The Law" on these matters, is conclusive evidence!

I wish (leaving quite out of sight the question of a strange analogous rite used amongst the Copts, &c.) I could think that Circumcision would check prurient

curiosity and indecency in *boys*, or lust and excessive desire in men.

August 17. C. P. C.

—:o:—

CONTINUOUS LIFE.

SIR,—As a parent I cannot help thinking that one main source of English evil is the complete acquiescence of the nation in schools which *cannot* do their duty by *each boy*, and the vast amount of uncared-for life which is in consequence let loose *as if* it had been cared for, and as if the result was a *misfortune* instead of a *crime*, as it is. For ignorance, moral and intellectual, *is* a crime where each person is properly cared for.

August 11. E. T.

—:o:—

TEETOTALISM.

It must be every honest person's wish during our short life to do all that is best. We can live but once here; so *at least*, we think, let us live that life well. This innate desire is often manifested in the direction of total abstinence from wine, beer, or spirits. The honest intention of such persons is plain and undoubted. But are they right, are they justified in the conclusions to which they have arrived?—that is the question. It is a difficult question—one which is sure to excite controversy—one which can be combated or defended on Scriptural grounds. The present writer is not a teetotaller, but opposed to the practice of total abstinence, nevertheless he desires to approach the subject with as much impartiality as possible.

The practice may be defended on Scriptural grounds by reference to such cases as St. John the Baptist and Timothy. But on the other hand our Saviour not only drank wine Himself, but performed His first miracle by turning water into wine, and consecrated its use at the Institution of the Lord's Supper. And St. Paul's injunction to Timothy was (1 Tim. 5, 23): "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmity."

It would be easy to multiply the Scriptural grounds for and against Teetotalism,—the drunkenness of Noah on the one hand and the vow of the Nazarites; the general use of wine in moderation by the great majority of people in all ages, as is evidenced by sacred and profane history. But of this we feel assured that the moderate use of wine, &c., is not in itself a sin. Whereas we see in all ages a certain number of enthusiasts abstaining totally from it; we should scarcely consider their conduct a sin either.

The just conclusion to be derived from the varying arguments seems to be that only the abuse of wine, &c., is sinful. To the Christian rejoicing in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made him free the moderate use is allowable, and also total abstinence. So let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind in such matters, and not judge others who may differ from him in practice.

T. ARCHIBALD S. WHITE, M.A.

—:o:—

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY.

SIR,—I don't think you *can* be surprised that the sermon preached by the Christian Evidence Society or by the clergymen sent out under their auspices should be as a rule so badly attended. For of all discourses I have ever read they are the driest of the dry. The fact is, few clergymen know how to handle this subject in a manner which will *arrest* attention. I have tried to wade through the long discursive address of Archdeacon Reichel, as reported in the July number of your excellent publication, and the wonder to me is that people could have quietly sat in their pews listening to such a wearisome harangue. The opponents of Christianity beat us into fits, in the manner of treating their subject so as to catch the ear of the people. Many of the so-called "Sermons in defence of the Christian Faith" are only fit for the waste paper basket.

Yours faithfully,

R. PARROTT, Vicar of Amwell, and
A Subscriber from the beginning to your publication.

[We insert Mr. Parrott's letter because we do not agree with him. We have received many letters speaking in highest terms of all the three Sermons which we have printed, especially of Archdeacon Reichel's. Of the latter Archdeacon Cheetham writes: "Reichel against Renan is very able, as he always is." Canon Farrar says, "Able and valuable." The empty Church is to be attributed to the inconvenient hour at which they were delivered, and the want of advertising. —ED.]

On Wednesday, the 4th inst., the Bishop of Lincoln re-opened the church of St. Oswald, Blankney, and at the luncheon which was subsequently given by Mr. and Lady Florence Chaplin, under a marquee in their park, the health of the right rev. prelate and the clergy of his diocese was proposed by Viscount Folkestone. In the course of his reply Bishop Wordsworth said:—"The great legislative body of which you, my lord, and my hon. friend Mr. Chaplin are distinguished members has been lately engaged in the discussion of important questions, and has shown itself not indisposed to entertain proposals of disestablishment. It has passed a measure for the disestablishment of Irish landlords. It has given a second reading to a Bill for the disestablishment of hares and rabbits; and we are told that it may not be unwilling, ere long, to encourage designs for the disestablishment of Bishops, priests, and deacons. If we are to be treated as 'ground game' I hope we may not sacrifice our principles, and that we fight manfully for them, and—pardon the expression—may 'die game.' I doubt not also, if we are to be disestablished, there will be 'Disturbance Compensation Bill,' especially if we agitate enough, and that we shall be treated with no less liberality than the Irish tenantry by the English Legislature. But to be serious. The present is a grave crisis in the affairs of the Church and realm of England. If our national institutions are to be preserved, the spiritual and temporal powers ought to be united in a strenuous effort to maintain them. In order that Church and State may prosper, the clergy and laity ought to combine heartily, and to co-operate vigorously together. Some hard things have lately been said of the clergy. It has been alleged that some of them are impatient, irritated, and exasperated by harsh treatment, and are endeavouring to combine two things which are irreconcilable—Churchmanship and democracy. There is some truth in this, and it is to be regretted. However ill-treated the clergy may be, yet they ought not to forget that they are ministers of peace; and, though it is no part of their duty to be politicians, yet they ought to be teachers and examples of loyalty and patriotism, and of obedience to order and law. But perhaps the clergy may be allowod to say something for themselves. There is, I fear, a species of Conservatism which deals with the Church as if it were

a creation of the State, a production of Parliament, and not a Divine institution, and which regards the clergy, not as having a Divine commission, but as little better—forgive the term—than policemen in black clothes. There is also, I fear, a kind of Conservatism which is very friendly to enemies, but not quite so cordial to its friends; and which thinks that it may conciliate the former without alienating the latter; and that it is sure of the votes of the clergy; and that its best policy, therefore, is to patronise their opponents. It has, I believe, led to the coolness and antipathy of the clergy, which some have censured as a fault. But if Conservatism is lukewarm towards the Church, the Church will not be enthusiastic for it. Let me illustrate what I mean by a practical example. If the Bishops, clergy and laity had been united, we should never have heard of the Burials Bill. Some lay the blame on the Bishops, but if they had been sure of the cordial support of the laity matters would, perhaps have been different from what they are. I feel bound to make an honourable exception on behalf of the noble earl, the leader of the Conservative party, who was most cordial in encouraging those who opposed that unhappy measure. And I might mention others. But of this I am quite sure—that a measure so unnecessary, so unreasonable, and so unrighteous as the Burials Bill would never have had the degree of success it has, if there had been the union that might have been expected between the clergy and laity of the Church. I have too good an opinion of the fairness, honesty, and good sense of the people of England to entertain a different opinion. For look carefully at the matter. Scotland did not want the bill. Ireland did not want the bill. Scotland and Ireland are expressly exempt from the bill; and Scotch and Irish members of Parliament have no right to say a word about it. Our great towns do not want it; they are provided with cemeteries. The only persons who have really a right to be heard upon the bill are the clergy and laity of an agricultural diocese like this, which it most intimately concerns, and would most seriously injure. Our clergy hate the bill. I have just received an address from more than six hundred of them in this diocese against the bill. The laity of the Church do not like it; indeed, I am told that in some rural dioceses the laity hate the bill as much as the clergy do. I doubt very much whether even Dissenting ministers are in love with the bill. And why? Because those ministers have no official *status* in it; they are nowhere. According to the bill they have no place as such; any man—any woman—a member of the "Peculiar People" as they are called, or of the "Salvation Army" as it is termed, or a female follower of Joanna Southcote, might officiate at a funeral in our churchyards, with a form of service, no one can tell what it may be, with how many hymns or addresses, or how long it may last. Our respectable Dissenting bretheren do not wish for the bill. I have not heard of a single petition from them in this diocese in its favour. Yesterday, at Marston, where I was re-opening a restored church, the principal proprietor of the parish said to me, 'My lord, I wish you would come and consecrate an addition to our churchyard,' 'No,' I replied; 'excuse me, I cannot now. If the Burials Bill passes consecration would be mockery, a nullity.' 'Oh! but,' he rejoined, 'the churchyard is quite full, and there is no room for burials in it; and the parishioners, who are mostly Dissenters, do not like their friends to be buried in the new part, because it is not consecrated.' What I say, therefore, is this—that if the Bishops, clergy, and laity were united in placing clearly and boldly such things as these before the English people, which is generous and just, and has strong, clear common sense, we should not hear any more of the Burials Bill. It is true that some would still clamour for it, but they have no right to be heard, they have no concern with it—at least, none compared with the concern that we in these English agricultural dioceses have—and they clamour for it, I believe, not because they care for it a bit for its own sake, but because they wish to use this bill as a powerful lever for tearing up the Church of England—as a national religious Establishment—by the roots. Let me conclude as I began. I have no desire—the clergy have no desire—to be politicians. We are not identified with any political party, but we desire to combine heartily, and to co-operate strenuously, with all those, whoever they may be, who are advocates and maintainers of religion, loyalty, and patriotism, of order, and of law—which is no other than the rule of God's providence in the government of the world."—Mr. Chaplin, M.P., in returning thanks for himself and Lady Florence, whose health had been cordially drunk, hoped he should not be misjudged if he differed from his lordship on the subject of the Burials Bill. "His lordship," said he, "has addressed you in terms which might, I think, lead some people to believe that even now it is not too late to stop the progress of the Burials Bill, or at least to cause it to be some years hence before it can come into operation. While I agree and sympathise with your views, my Lord Bishop, I am unable to endorse your opinion. When I remember that a measure of this nature has been carried by the Upper House of Parliament—and when I remember, too, the character of the Lower House, when, sitting in the house, I see around me a great number of men of extreme opinions, hostile to the Church—and when, knowing the immense influence wielded in the house by members of the Liberal party, and how small is the Conservative minority—I am obliged to tell you, freely and frankly, that, after this question has been carried in the House of Lords, I do not know how it would be possible for us to avert what his lordship looks upon as a great catastrophe. If that measure should pass, I trust the catastrophe may be less than his lordship supposes it is likely to be. I object to the measure, and gladly would I see such a measure postponed; but I should be telling you what I fear will not take place if I said it was possible to be postponed"

A letter, dated Melbourne, South Australia, June 21, says:—"A gentleman here has just given £10,000 towards the new cathedral, which I am sorry to say they are going to build in a hole simply to be near the railway station. It is curious how English churches are so often out of sight, while the most imposing buildings are Roman Catholic churches. Tuesday was the Queen's accession, and at the church I went to they had the entire service for the day—I never remember hearing it at home—and after the service the choir sang "God save the Queen." They "fustrated their knavish tricks" and went right through it, and many people r emained standing in church till it was ended. People out here are more loyal than at home."

Toe Rev. A. Snell, M.A., who has been appointed Honorary Canon of St. Albans, graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, as a senior optime in 1857. In 1859 he was ordained by the Bishop of London. He was curate of Wanstead till 1865. He was perpetual curate of Manningtree 1865-6, the vicar of Feering 1866-73. In 1878 he was appointed vicar of Witham, and in the following year Rural Dean.

The Queen has consented to place a stained-glass window in St. Mary's, Bury St. Edmund's in memory of one of her ancestors who fs interred their.

The Rev. George Herbet Morberly, rector of Dunts-bourne Rouse, and son of the Bishop of Salisbury, has been appointed Principal of Lichfield Theological College. Mr. Moberly was fomerly a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and obtained the Ellerton Theological Prize and the Arnold Essay.

In the new Jewish Callendar for 5,641, the editor, Grand Rabbi Servi, Director of the *Vessillo Israelitico*, divides the Jewish population of the world as follows: Europe, 4,500,000; Asia, 3,800,000; Africa, 500,000; America, 300,000; and Oceania, 110,000, making a total of 9,210,000.

We understand that Mr. Gladstone has nominated the Rev. Marshall Wild, vicar of Poynton, Stockport, to the vicarage of Newark, Notts, vacant by the elevation of the Rev. Dr. Pearson to the bishopric of Newcastle, New South Wales. Mr. Wild was formerly curate of Newark, and in 1864 was appointed to Poynton by Lord Vernon.

Last week a curious meeting was held at Bilston, the object being to consider whether the parishioners should sell the advowson of the living, which has been in the hands of the parishioners ever since the Reformation. The vicarage is put down in the *Clergy Directory* as worth £750 per annum, and a residence. It was proposed that the living should be sold, and half the purchase-money devoted to the repair of the church and half to an improvement rate. A Wesleyan seconded the resolution, and a Congregational minister supported it. Only twenty parishioners voted against the proposal.

The Rev. Brooke Lambert has been presented by the Queen to the living of Greenwich, vacant by the death of Canon Miller. Mr. Lambert graduated at Oxford (Brazenose College) in 1858, and, being ordained in the same year, was appointed curate of Christ Church, Preston, was subsequently curate of St. John, Worcester (1860-63), and of St. Mark's, Whitechapel (1864). In 1865 he was appointed vicar of St. Mark's, Whitechapel, in 1871 he became vicar of Rainhill, and in 1872 vicar of Tamworth, which living he recently resigned as offering no adequate income.

A great gathering of more than fifteen hundred school children was held at White-Horse-hill, Berkshire, in connection with the Sunday-school Centenary. A previous meeting of clergy and Sunday-school teachers had taken place at Faringdon some weeks before, at which papers were read and addresses given by Arbhdeacon Pott, the Rev. H. Barne, vicar of Faringdon, the Rev. H. Miller, Mr. Thomas Hughes, and others. The village of Ashbury is remarkable as being the place where the Rev. Thomas Stock, who in conjunction with the well-known Mr. Raikes, afterwards established Sunday-schools at Gloucester, commenced his ministerial labours in 1775.

The following petition has been forwarded to the Bishop of Exeter signed by fifteen of the clergy:—"We, the undersigned clergy of the deanery of Okehampton, feeling very strongly the dishonour done to the "one faith," and the pain inflicted on the consciences of Churchmen, by the Burials Bill, earnestly pray your lordship, as the exponent of the almost universal feeling of this diocese in the House of Lords, to abstain from voting on the bill on its return, amended or otherwise, from the House of Commons. We do not desire to dictate in any way to your lordship the views you should yourself hold, but respectfully address you as the exponent of the views of the clery and Church laity of your diocese."

On Friday the Rev. Henry Wright, minister of St. John's Chapel, Downshire-hill, Hampstead, honorary secretary to the Church Missionary Society, was drowned while bathing at Coniston, Cumberland, whither he had gone with his wife and eleven children (the youngest about two years old) for a holiday. Accompanied by his four sons, he went to the lake to bathe. He and the two elder boys, all good swimmers, took a boat and rowed out about a quarter of a mile, leaving the two younger in the shallow water. The elder boys leaped from the boat and struck out for the shore, their father following, when suddenly it is supposed he was seized with cramp. His dangerous position was percieved by two gentlemen on the bank, who called out to the boys to return to their father's assistance. This they at once did, one in time to sieze his father, already under water, and for some moments to support him, until he, too, began to sink. He then made for the boat, while the elder brother, arriving and seeing his father sink, dived in the vain hope of saving him. The body was not recovered till 3 p.m. the next day. Mr. Wright, who was about forty-seven years of age, was a son of the late Mr. Francis Wright, of Osmaston Manor, Derbyshire, and a member of a well-known family of bankers at Nottingham, to which the late Mr. Ichabod Charles Wright, the translator of *Dante*, also belonged. Mr. Henry Wright was educated at Baliol College, Oxford, where he took his degree in 1856, obtaining honours in the Classical and Natural Science Schools. He was ordained in 1857 by Bishop Lonsdale, of Lichfield. He held the perpetual curacy of Swanwick, Derbyshire, and the Chaplaincy of the Butterley Manufacturing Company, from 1857 to 1867, and the rectory of St. Nicholas, Nottingham, from the latter date down to 1872; and he was nominated to the prebendal stall of Oxgate, in St. Paul's Cathedral, last year. In 1875 he succeeded the Rev. C. H. Waller at Downshire-hill, and his official connection with the Church Missionary Society had lasted about eight years. The last time he officiated at St. Paul's was on St. Barnabas' Day, when he preached the ordination sermon on the occasion of a number of missionary candidates from the college at Islington being ordained by the Bishop of London. His untimely death, it need hardly be said, caused a deep and painful shock amongst the congregation. At the morning service on Sunday the Rev. W. Chapman, assistant-minister, preaching from Gen. v. 24, dwelt on the grief which had been brought to a united, happy family, to that congregation, and to many friends, not only in England but in every part of the world. He also spoke of the character, the life, and the ministry of the deceased gentleman, and, in speaking of his missionary zeal, stated that his last sermon. preached last Sunday evening at Keswick, was on behalf of the Church Missionary Society. At St. Paul's the afternoon sermon was preached by Dr. Liddon, the canon in residence. The rev. gentleman said that the authorities at that Cathedral had within the last few days had special cause for mourning. Since the previous Sunday two of the Prebendaries had been called to their last account—one of them, Mr. Auriol, in the fulness of age, but the other, Mr. Wright, in the prime of life, prematurely removed from his ministerial work in this world, and in a moment taken away from his numerous and bereaved family.—On Saturday the widow was confined of another son.

It seems difficult to arrive with certainty at the number of livings advertised for sale, actual or virtual, every week; and the estimates given by different witnesses vary rather surprisingly. A well-known agent (Mr. Stark) estimates the livings annually offered for actual sale at about two hundred; another witness, who has given careful attention to the subject from without, goes so far as to surmise that "ten per cent. of the entire livings in the Church"—about thirteen thousand, if it all be taken; about seven thousand, if only those in private patronage be referred to—are in some way sold or bartered every year. The truth probably lies between these two extreme estimates. If those exchanges which are really sales in disguise be included, perhaps the actual average will not be far from one every day in the year. But even the lowest estimate will probably startle churchmen generally, and will certainly convince all who think on the subject that the matter is one of very serious extent—the more so, because evidedce seems to show that it is increasing, and that, especially, the number of clerical patrons who in some way traffic in living grows larger every year. When we consider the spiritual harm, and the far wider scandal, which one manifestly improper sale must cause, we shall surely do well to turn a deaf ear to those who tell us that the evil, if it exists, is so exceptional that it may be neglected without serious risk.—*The Guardian.*

BOOKS, &c., RECEIVED.

"NIGH UNTO THE END." By J. C. Boyce, M.A. Bentley and Son.
"THE SABBATH MADE FOR MAN." G. A. Jacob, D.D. S. W. Partridge and Co.
"FAMILY DEVOTION." Charles Rogers, LL.D. S. W. Partridge and Co.
"MEMOIR OF REV. H. VENN. William Knight, M.A. Longmans and Co.
"HINTS TO PREACHERS." S. Reynolds Hole. James Parker and Co.
"SOCIAL NOTES." Wyman and Sons.

———:o:———

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. Arthur Henry, incumbent of Storridge, Herefordshire.
Arkell, Rev. John, rector of St. Ebbe's, Oxford.
Barber, Rev. J. H., curate-in-charge of St. Olave, Hart-street, with All Hallows, Staining.
Becker, Rev. F. W., vicar of St. Luke's, Holbeach.
Oiel, Rev. Maxwell Mochluff Ben, minister of St. Saviour's, South Kensington.
Bliss, Rev. James, rector of Manningford Bruce, Wilts.
Bokenhan, Rev. Clifton, vicar of West Wratling.
Cochrane, Rev. James Henry Dickson, perpetual curate of St. Saviour's, Everton.
Crossle, Rev. George Atkinson, vicar of Ukeley, otherwise Ugley.
Crump, Rev. Thomas, perpetual curate of Corfe.
Dunlop, Rev. Robert Vetch, perpetual curate of Holy Trinity, Scarborough.
Elrington, Rev. Charles, perpetual Curate of Newbarns and Hawcoat, Lancashire.
Farmer, Rev. James, vicar of St. Paul's, Nottingham.
Fisher, Rev. Robert, perpetual curate of Killington, Westmoreland.
Fletcher, Rev. Henry William Overstreet, chaplain Ostend.
Gardner, Rev. Hilton, perpetual curate of St. Ann's, Stanley, West Derby.
Glyn, Rev. Henry Thomas, rector of Fontmell Magna with West Orchard, Dorset.
Hall, Rev. Samuel Howard, vicar of Christ Church, Chesham, Bucks.
Jarratt, Rev. Frederick, rector of Goodleigh.
Kitchin, Rev. F., incumbent of St. James's, Muthill, Perthshire examining chaplain to the Bishop of St. Andrew's.
Knowles, Rev. Francis, perpetual curate of Silsden.
Knox, Rev. Lindsey Neville, rector of Creeton.
Macfarlane, Rev. Thomas, vicar of Clyro with Bettws Clyro, Radnorshire.
Meurant, Rev. Arthur Richardson, perpetual curate of Stanley.
Miller, Rev. Augustus Jameson, vicar of Middleton, Leeds.
Prickard, Rev. William Edward, rector of Disserth with Bettws Disserth, Radnorshire.
Raikes, Rev. Walter Allan, vicar of Ide Hill.
Rees, Rev. Samuel George, vicar of Abb Kettle-by-cum-Holwell.
Robertson, Rev. David, rector of Market Deeping; rector of Hartlebury.
Smith, Rev. Joseph Bernard, vicar of St. James, Stubbings, Berks.
Stone, Rev. Arthur Edward; Chaplain Bengal.
Thomas, Rev. Thomas, perpetual curate of Llechoyd, Cardiganshire.
Tompkins, Rev. H. A. C., vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Wick. the Rev. C. R. Davy, of Tracy Park.
Trower, Rev. John, vicar of Wortley, Leeds.
Turner, Rev. G. W., curate-in-charge of Aston; vicar of St. Jude's, Eldon.
Wetherall, Rev. Charles Maunsell, vicar of All Saints', Brank-some Park, Dorset.
White, Rev. John, vicar of Dacre, Cumberland.
White, Rev. John Benny, rector of Puddington; vicar of Radford Semele, vacant by death of Rev. T. B. Whitehurst.
Wild, Rev. Marshall, vicar of Poynton, vicar of Newark.
Willan, Rev. William, perpetual curate of Roecliffe.
Williams, Rev. George Arthur, vicar of Weston Beggard, Herefordshire.

——:o:——

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Alsop, James Richard, B.A., thirteen years vicar of Acton Trussell and Bednall, Staffordshire, and formerly for twenty-six years Perpetual Curate of Westhoughton, Bolton-le-Moors, on the 6th inst.
Auriol, Rev. Edward, at 35, Mecklenbugh-square, late rector of St. Dunstan-in-the-West, and prebendary of St. Paul's, on the 10th inst., aged 75.
Boissier, Rev. Peter Henry, at 5, Leicester-place, Clifton, Bristol on the 5th inst., aged 57.
Cockey, Rev. Edward, M.A., rector of Fryerning, Essex, late fellow and tutor of Wadham College, Oxford, on the 7th inst., aged 71.
Cotter, Rev. George Edmond, M.A., at Rockforest, Cork, rector of Monanimy, third and last surviving son of the late Sir J. L. Cotter, Bart., M.P. for Mallow, on the 6th inst., aged 85.
Foster, Rev. William, late fellow of Magdalene College. Cambridge, at Hilston, Holderness, on the 4th inst., aged 71,
Fowler, Rev. Alfred, curate-in-charge of that parish, after a short illness, at Compton Beauchamp, Shrivenham, on the 8th inst., aged 46.
Francken, Rev. C. W., at 6, Chiswick-place, Eastbourne, formerly vicar of Wicken, Cambridgeshire, on the 15th inst. aged 83.
Harman, Rev. John, M.A., at St. James's Vicarage, Enfield Highway, vicar of the parish and chaplain to the Royal Ordnance Factory, Enfield Lock, on the 16th inst. aged 64.
Howes, Rev. Charles, M.A., late fellow of Dulwich College, and youngest son of the late Rev. F. Howes, M.A., minor canon of Norwich Cathedral, on the 3rd inst., aged 66.
Kempthorne, Rev. John, M.A., late fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, at the vicarage, Trumpington, on the 5th inst., aged 45.
King, Rev. Wingfield William, M.A., at Bournemouth, vicar of Wraysbury, Bucks, on the 14th inst. aged 34.
Nevinson, Rev. Charles, M.A., at Stamford, warden of Brown's Hospital, on the 12th inst. in the 65th year of his age.
Swainson, Rev. James H., M.A., for many years rector of Alresford, Essex, and rural dean, at Clarens, Switzerland, on the 4th inst., aged 73.
Williams, Rev. John, M.A., Oxon, late vicar of Gringley, Notts, and Wallington, Surrey, on the 5th inst. aged 64.
Wright, Rev. Henry, drowned whilst bathing in Coniston Lake, prebendary of St. Paul's, honourary secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and minister of St. John's Chapel, Hampstead, on the 13th inst. aged 47.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE SYMPATHY OF CHRIST.

By the Very Rev. DEAN BAGOT, D.D.,
Late Dean of Dromore, and Vicar-General of Newry and Morne, &c.

"We have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."—Heb. iv. 15.

THE Epistle to the Hebrews, which might be termed the New Testament or Evangelical book of Leviticus, is supposed to have been written by the Apostle Paul. It was evidently intended for the instruction and comfort of believing Jewish converts, in order to confirm their judgment as to the transcendent excellency of the Gospel above the Law, and to persuade them to maintain a constant and inflexible adherence to their profession of faith in Christ, notwithstanding the many sufferings and trials which they might be called upon to endure. In carrying out this object, the Apostle is led to illustrate the relationship which subsisted between the Jewish and the Christian dispensations—to show how the former was Subordinate and preparatory to the latter, that its priesthood, its sacrifices, and its entire ritual were only shadows and types of better things to come, and were intended to act as so many indices to direct the mind to a contemplation of that great atoning work which the Son of God was to accomplish when the fulness of the time for His manifestation in the flesh had arrived. In the first chapter he speaks in the loftiest strains of inspired rhetoric of the *abstract personal dignity* of Christ, as being superior to angels and as occupying the very same throne of supreme dominion with the everlasting Father. He then goes on to shew his *official superiority* to Moses, as the Head and founder of a Church of which Moses was only a member. He next enlarges upon his priesthood, which he maintains to be in every respect of a vastly higher order and dignity than the priesthood under the Law—asserting that He was "a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people," and that we have a great High Priest who is passed into the Heavens—not an High Priest, like the Jewish, which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but one who was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

Now in this important statement there are three topics for consideration.—1. The office which Christ sustains. 2. The discipline by which he was prepared for it. And 3. The manner in which he discharges it.

1. The office which Christ sustains, for it is of him that the Apostle speaks, as he says in the verse immediately preceding—"We have a great High Priest, that is passed into the Heavens, Jesus the Son of God." Our great and glorious Redeemer is invested with every office which it is necessary that he should exercise for promoting the welfare, the safety, and the happiness of his people. He is a Prophet to instruct, a King to govern, a Priest to offer an atoning sacrifice for our sins, and a High Priest sitting at the right hand of God, where He ever liveth to make intercession for us. He was a *Priest* on *Earth*, He is a *High Priest* in *Heaven*. And He was not only a Priest on earth, but He was also the *Sacrifice* and the *Altar*. As Emmanuel God and man in One person He was the *Priest;* His human nature consisting of his soul and body was the victim, and his *Godhead* Nature was the altar which sanctified the gift of His humanity for the infinite dignity of His essential nature as God attached an imperishable worth and efficacy to the Sacrificial Sufferings which he endured as man. He has been invested with this office by the Ordination and the Oath of the everlasting Father, who hath sworn and will not repent—"Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek." He is the *Antitype* of whom all the Priests under the Jewish dispensation were only *types*. He was consecrated by the unction of the Holy Spirit which was given to Him without measure. He offered Himself as a sacrifice to God more grateful than all the victims that ever smoked upon a Jewish altar, because His own love to man was the fire that issued from His heart to consume it! The legal Priesthood may well cast aside their robes and resign their office. Their work is finished—"finished all the types and shadows of the ceremonial Law." What they could not do by multiplied oblations, Christ has effected by the offering of Himself once for all, by which He has made reconciliation for iniquity, and has obtained eternal Redemption for us.

But Christ was not only a *Priest* on *earth* but, as I have said, he is now a *High Priest* in *Heaven*. Having, as *Priest*, offered His sacrifice upon earth of which the first tabernacle under the Law was a type, he then entered as High Priest into the Holiest of all, even into Heaven itself, that he might sprinkle the very throne of God with His most precious blood, so as to convert a throne of judgment into a throne of *Grace*. "For Christ," says the Apostle, "is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are only the figures of the true, but into Heaven itself now to appear in the presence of God for us." *There* He superintends the concerns and the interests of His Church, He administers all things connected with the diffusion of the Gospel, from thence as the One and Only Mediator between God and man, he sends down blessings upon his people: there

> "Where high the Heavenly Temple stands,
> The House of God not made with hands,
> A great High Priest our nature wears,
> The Guardian of Mankind appears;

He, Who for men their surety stood,
And poured on earth His precious blood,
Pursues in heaven His mighty plan,
The Saviour and the Friend of Man."

2. We now proceed to consider what was the *experience* and the *discipline* by which Christ was prepared for His office of High Priest—"He was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." This statement may refer to the sufferings which our Blessed Redeemer endured in the days of His humiliation, by which His fortitude, His patience, His steadfastness, and His confidence in His Heavenly Father were tried and tested; for "it became Him, for Whom are all things, and by Whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the Captain of their Salvation perfect through sufferings." And what mind can conceive, what tongue can express, the intensity of those sufferings which Christ underwent? He was subjected to pain and poverty and privation. He endured calumny, reproach and sorrow. Persecuted by His enemies, and deserted by His friends, He at length suffered death in its most agonizing and ignominious form. His sufferings must have been infinitely more severe than any of His followers have ever been called upon to endure, when they extorted from Him the sad and sorrowful exclamation—"My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

It is, however, most likely to the temptations which He sustained from Satan, the Prince of this World, that reference is here made. A remarkable specimen of which we have in the account of His being led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil. Now although He was exposed to these temptations, yet He did not yield to them. Still, the fact of His having been tempted was sufficient to give Him a personal knowledge of what the violence and importunity of temptations are, and to prove to Him by an immediate and a felt demonstration how weak and impotent our human nature is. This was, in fact, the leading object of His Temptations; they constituted a portion of that discipline and experience by which He was made a merciful and faithful High Priest, as it is written in the second chapter of this Epistle—"In all things it behoved Him to be made a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people; for in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted."

But let us notice how the Apostle specifies one thing in particular in which there was an exception in respect to our Saviour's experience of our infirmities: "He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin." He knew what it was to be tempted to sin, but He did not in any instance yield to sin. If He had done so, this would have disqualified Him for His office, for it is written that "Such an High Priest became us who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." "The Prince of this World cometh and hath nothing in Me," said Christ to His disciples, "but he cometh in order that the world may know that I love the Father, and that as the Father gave Me commandment, even so I do."* As if He had said —"I am subjected to the temptations of Satan, not that there is any sinful feeling or tendency in Me which could lead Me to yield to them, but in order to give Me an opportunity of proving to the world that I have holiness both in *principle* and in *practice*, —love to the Father as my constantly actuating principle, and a perfect compliance with His commandments as the practical result of its constraining influence. But the fact of Christ being without sin does not, and cannot in the slightest degree interfere with, or prevent His sympathy with us. On the contrary, His holiness and moral purity had the effect of giving greater poignancy and acuteness to His sufferings under temptation, and caused Him to feel more keenly the misery and the wretchedness that accompany sin in us. Thus He was prepared by sufferings and temptations for the High Office which He now sustains, and thus "being made perfect, He has become the Author of Eternal Salvation unto all them that obey Him."

3. We have now to consider the manner in which Christ discharges the functions of High Priest. Unlike the Jews, "we who are Christians have not an High Priest like theirs, which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities," or, "who cannot sympathise with our infirmities." This brings home to our meditations a most interesting subject—the sympathy of Jesus. And when we speak of this, it is with reference to His human nature, that nature which He possesses in common with those whom He came to redeem, that we speak. In His *divine* nature He cannot be moved or affected by *human* feelings. As God He *knows*, but as man He *feels* the infirmities that are incidental to the weakness of our nature. As God He "knoweth whereof we are made, He remembereth that we are but dust;" but as man He is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, for they have been brought into close and immediate contact with His own personal experience, so that inasmuch "as He himself hath suffered, being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted." It requires a similarity or rather a sameness of nature in order to enter into the feelings, and to have a communion with the sufferings of others. In His Divine Nature our blessed Redeemer could *pity* us, could have *compassion* for us, could extend mercy to us; but the text speaks of more than all this, it speaks of sympathy, and the only basis of sympathy is a personal and experimental acquaintance with the woes and infirmities of those for whom we feel. For this then, amongst other reasons, our Divine Redeemer became man, that He might acquire this personal intimacy with suffering and sorrow, that He might be united, or, I might say, identified with us in the closest bonds of brotherhood, so that it can now be said that "He knows what strong temptations are, for He hath felt

* John, xiv. 30, 31.

the same." The glory of His Divine Person and the transcendant dignity of His exaltation may give us confidence and courage in a dark and trying hour, but the brightness of His glory, and the height of His exaltation are enhanced and endeared to His suffering people, by the affecting consideration that He Himself was once a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, that He once trod the vale of tears which they now tread, that He knew what it was to live a suffering life, and to die a painful death! Yes! Our Divine Redeemer can sympathize with those who mourn, for once He groaned in spirit and was troubled when He saw Mary weeping and the Jews also weeping that were with her, and He shed tears of sympathy at the grave of her brother Lazarus which drew forth from the surrounding spectators the emphatic exclamation: "Behold, how He loved him." There is not a fear which He cannot dissipate, a care which He cannot relieve, a loss which He cannot repair, a wound which He cannot heal. Our sorrows and our trials excite in His mind a deep and peculiar feeling of intense and earnest sympathy. In angels they can only produce feelings of commiseration. Those pure and happy inhabitants of heaven, who live and move and have their being within the full sunshine of God's eternal glory, may often shed, as it were, tears of pity upon the record of the sorrows and the trials and temptations of those to whom they are appointed to be ministering spirits, but from want of an experience of those sufferings they are incapable of sympathy. But Jesus the Son of God, our Great High Priest, is touched with the feeling of our infirmities. He knows our sorrows, not merely by virtue of His Omniscience as God, but by His experience as man, as One who has been in our situation, and who, though without sin, endured, when on earth, far more than he ever requires His people to undergo. He has consecrated and sanctified poverty, disgrace, temptation, pain and death, by passing through them all in their most fearful and agonizing forms, so that in whatever state His people are, they may by faith have fellowship with Him in his sufferings, and He may have fellowship with them by sympathy and love. His absence from His Church now militant here on earth does not impair or diminish that sympathy. He has passed into the heavens, but He has carried His human heart and His human feelings with Him, and such is His sympathy that He feels the sufferings and the sorrows of His people as if they were His own. When Saul was persecuting the members of the Church on earth, the Head of the Church uttered His complaint from Heaven. Just as the woman of Canaan made her daughter's misery her own, when she exclaimed—"Have mercy on me, O Lord thou Son of David, my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil." So Christ made the sufferings of His people His own, and said: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou *Me*." And how remarkable it was that the very first lesson which Paul was taught by the revelation of Jesus Christ was a lesson upon the sympathy of Jesus. What a source of unspeakable comfort should this subject afford to us, and to all who believe in Him. How consoling the reflection that He is now the same in this respect in Heaven as He was upon earth; that

> "He still remembers in the skies
> His tears, His agonies and cries,
> And as our Great High Priest retains
> A fellow feeling for our pains."

The throne has not led Him to forget the Cross, His diadem of glory has not erased from His memory the Crown of Thorns; amidst the joys of Heaven He does not disregard the sorrows and sufferings of His Church militant here on earth. Let us then be led by the reflections which the text suggests, to comply with the exhortation by which it is *introduced*, and by which it is *followed*. "Seeing that we have a Great High Priest that is passed into the Heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession," and seeing that we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but One who can sympathise with us, inasmuch as He Himself was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin, let us come boldly, in the confidence of a strong and unshrinking faith, to a Throne of Grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need, and when we shall be permitted to stand before His Throne of Glory, clothed in robes made white in His Blood, and with palms of triumph in our hands, we shall have fellowship with Him in the enjoyment of pleasures for evermore in His Eternal Kingdom:

> "Then shall the saints immortal rise
> To blissful mansions in the skies,
> With bodies pure and bright.
> And, all their toils and conflicts o'er,
> Abide with Christ for evermore,
> In realms of peace and light."

THE REALITY OF THE FUTURE LIFE.

By the Rev. COURTENAY MOORE, M.A.,
Rector of Castletown Roche, Diocese of Cloyne;
Member of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland.

Sermon Preached in St. Stephen's Church, Dublin.

"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."—2 Cor. v. 1.

I WAS lately conversing with one who told me he had not long before left the death-bed of a relative. What a mystery, he said, is life, and its conclusion, death. We knew the sufferer was ill and not likely to recover, but, up to a few minutes before his death, it was not immediately expected. Suddenly the change came; there were a few gasps, and all was over. *What*, he said, was that which had departed, and *whither* had it gone? What a

mystery! and to this it might be added that the *whence* is an equal mystery—viz., how our earthly life begins is just as inexplicable as how it ends. Inquiries of this nature will suggest themselves to thoughtful minds, and in the present day, as we both hear and read of the denial of any conscious life beyond the grave, it may be well to look generally at some features of the subject. You may remember that a few years since the President of the British Association, in his lecture delivered at Belfast, spoke of the hereafter of man as of that of clouds mellowing into the infinite azure; that consequently after death there was no individual existence—no consciousness of anything. Now there are two ways in which we may deal with assertions of this kind. If we really believe in the truths of Christianity; if we "believe in the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting;" if "we look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come" as truths taught us by a revelation from God, we shall each of us say, I am a *Christian*, and the reality of the future life is an article of the *Christian* Faith. It is taught us by God in His Holy Word. The Lord Jesus has often dwelt upon the intensity both of blessing and misery in the world to come; His Apostles have taught the *same* truth; the Holy Church throughout all the world has ever professed her belief in it. Therefore unless I relinquish my belief in Christianity, I cannot deny the reality, the *intense* reality, of "the life of the world to come." A reality so great that it has been expressed by St. Paul in the striking words: "The things that are seen are temporal, but the things that are unseen are eternal." A statement such as this will of course bring the matter to a decided issue, for it is evident that he who asserts that there is no conscious life after death cannot be a Christian, cannot be a believer in the Bible as a revelation to us of the mind and will God upon this and upon other subjects. Now this is our true stand-point in the matter; as we may perhaps see presently there is another way of dealing with the question, but there is an aspect of our first portion of the subject still left unconsidered, which is this:—The philosophers of the present day who deny any conscious existence after death as called Secularists or Positivists, and we may naturally ask them that, considering the incalculable influence upon mankind of a belief in the world to come as a check upon evil and incentive to good, what are we to put in its place if we give it up? If we are to give up all this and put it away as a *childish* thing, useful only in the days of the world's infancy and ignorance, what is there that a thoughtful mind in the Nineteenth Century may hold without fear and without reproach? Well we are told with great earnestness that so far as a man's individual personal existence is concerned the grave *is* the end; yet that there *is* a life beyond it, but that this consists only in the results produced for the benefit of humanity by the labours carried on here during a man's life-time.—That if he has been useful in his day and generation his good deeds will continue to bear fruit among successive generations of his fellow men, and that in *this* sense a man does not perish in natural death and that there is *thus* in store for us a glorious future in which every good and earnest man will have his share.

Now if it were not alleged that this is the only future to which we can look forward, there is nothing in it that reason and religion have not already taught us. We know that good men and clever men by their conduct and discoveries continue to exercise influence here for good long after they themselves have passed away, *e.g.*, the men who invented the printing press and the steam engine have lived largely in this sort of future. Latimer, as he walked to the stake, congratulated Ridley that by God's grace they were that day lighting a candle in England that would never be put out; therefore he anticipated it. And in humbler and narrower spheres this is quite clearly understood. Many a one is remembered for good in a neighbourhood long after he is dead and gone, for having been a kind friend, a wise councillor, an upright honourable man in his dealings, who was beloved and respected in his day and generation; and this is a sort of influence which by God's grace is within the reach of all, if only we will. The Positivist philosopher therefore here gives us no new view in this conception of a future life. It is the common property of all good men, and belongs as fully and as justly to Christians as to those who reject Christianity.

But surely it seems to be merely playing with words, to stop short here and call this conception of the future, a future *life*. If there is no conscious existence after death, no distinct separate existence of the soul, no capacity for reward or punishment, if our earthly life be that alone which is individual, and the future life one in which the result of our conduct will only form part of the future of humanity, a consequence of which we shall then be utterly unconscious, it is really idle to talk of this as a future life at all. It is not the future life which is the hope of the Christian, not the entering into the rest that remaineth for the people of God, not the life in the many mansions of our Father's House, where there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, not crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things have passed away. It is not the sort of future life that implies either the love or justice of God, for it utterly fails by the loss of the idea of a future recompense, when every one shall receive the due reward of the deeds done in the body, whether they be good or evil, to reconcile our moral sense to the apparent injustices of the present scene of trial and suffering. And this is quite contrary to our ideas of God's justice, and it is equally irreconcilable with our ideas of His love, as it makes man the victim of many cruel sufferings and earnest longings, which are destined never to be redressed and satis-

fied if his theory be true. But, as I have already said, if we are Christians it can cause us no anxiety, for read in the light of God's Holy Word, it is utterly false, and this is our readiest and best answer formulated for us in the language of the Creeds, "I look for the Resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come." "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

But these modern philosophers say the expectation of a life of joy and happiness beyond the grave is *selfish*, and by this they mean to charge Christians with working from an unworthy motive, while they themselves act aright merely from a sense of duty, without dwelling on the fact that it is quite possible they may not be uninfluenced by the desire for posthumous notoriety; it is surely fair to reply that there is nothing selfish in the desire to see God, to worship Him, and to understand many things which we now see as in a glass darkly. The Spirit of Christ is the spirit which animates Heaven, and we know from the Gospels that that Spirit is the reverse of all that is selfish. Beside, to charge Christianity with a selfish view of the future life, would imply that the Christian Church had some share in arranging or procuring the nature of the future state of happiness. Whereas the truth is she rests upon no invention of her own, but upon that which rightly or wrongly she holds to be revealed truth. Each article of the Creed is, to her apprehension, a solemn fact which God has told her. She says "I *believe* in the Resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come." Now I have not invented these things, or asked for them or wished for them, but I accept them because Jesus Christ has told me they are true, and because He came down from Heaven, and was made man, for the purpose of teaching me these and many like things that concern my salvation.*

The foregoing being laid down as our first and best line of meeting difficulties of this kind, it might now briefly be pointed out that arguing the matter upon the ground of reason alone, the balance of evidence decidedly inclines to the Christian view of the future state, indeed Dugald Stewart, a celebrated thinker, has stated that the arguments from reason for a future life when taken in conjunction with each other, seem to have an irresistible force. Both time and place forbid anything like a full review of these, even were I able to present it to you. And what follows under this head must now necessarily be brief and meagre. It is evident that the denial of any life after death arises from exclusive attention to the body, which is assumed to be the whole of us, the mind being only the result or outcome of the action of a part of the body, viz., the brain; when therefore, the bodily machine ceases to act at death all is over, for there is no longer anything to produce thought. This is what is truly called the materialistic view, because it makes matter the source of mind. You see it does not recognise the separate, independent existence of mind or soul at all, which we naturally regard as a false and unscientific view of the case. No combination of matter brought about by man has ever been found to produce mind, and so long as this is the case it should check the confident assertion that the human mind is not a separately-existing substance, but merely a result of the action of the brain. But another most valid objection to the views of modern sceptics is that their conclusions being exclusively drawn from this one point, viz., the mere functions, so to speak, of the human body, they leave entirely out of sight the great moral argument, viz, the inherent ideas we have of God's justice and wisdom in the government of the world. This perhaps will be made plainer by an illustration. Take, *e.g.*, no uncommon case, that of the family of a peasant, robbed, dishonoured, and murdered during a time of war. Imagine yourself looking at their dead and dishonoured bodies. The Positive philosopher says of them, "Well, poor people, they were terribly afflicted, but all is over now; their machines have ceased to act, they no longer produce thought or feeling; they no longer produce a sense of fear or shame, or loss or cruel wrong; after life's fitful fever they sleep well." I ask this philosopher—Is there no future to these poor people, in which God can compensate them for their sufferings and punish those who despitefully used them. No, he replies, how can there be, when the human machine is destroyed? *it* was all and everything, it no longer acts, and therefore *all* is over, there is *no* future for them. Then it follows, I enquire, that the wrong-doer and he whom he wronged are eventually consigned to the same oblivion by death? Yes, he says, both their machines have stopped, and neither can be conscious of either reward or punishment. If this be so, my brethren, for my own part I can only say that I do not see how any belief in God as a just and merciful Governor of the Universe can continue to exist. Surely, taking the illustration now before us, it is *far* less of a difficulty to believe that death is not the end of all than that it *is;* surely the *moral* argument here is *far* stronger than the mere materialistic one. In other words, is it not far less difficult to believe that there *is* a future life in which God will, as Judge of all the earth, do right, than that there is none? I can see no difficulty equal to this latter view; and I think it is far more philosophical to believe that the Creator can either enable the mind to work without its old bodily organ, or provide it with a new one, than to infer that mind and body alike perish in one common destruction.*

As *Christians*, we have *no* doubt upon the subject, "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of

* See Sermon by Bishop of Carlisle in "Clergyman's Magazine" for January, 1878, which has been largely availed of above.

* See Butler's Analogy, part 1, cap. 1.

God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

"Life is real: life is earnest,
And the grave is not its goal,
Dust thou art, to dust returnest
Was not spoken of the soul."

Speaking of the melancholy opinions to which we have referred, a recent writer* thus eloquently says:—"If death is to break the bench of life for ever, life is a business that does not pay. The belief that this is but the threshold of existence, that man is the meeting-point of two worlds, that the creature who is the head and crown of the natural, is born a child into the spiritual and eternal sphere, and that the issues of life's toils, tears, and martyrdoms lie beyond the gate of death, has furnished to man the inspiration to endure. But this, we learn from those who would bury life in profound and hopeless sadness, is illusion, *benign* illusion; when it has strung man's energy to toil and suffer its work is *done*, there is nothing beyond! One thing only is wanting further, some knowledge of the demon who has made and who rules the universe on this scheme of illusion, and has been able to persuade the human generations to toil, to suffer, to agonise, upon a lie.

No! While the bird still 'flies into the lighted hall out of the night, enjoys the brightness and warmth for the moment, and then flies out again into the night,' the 'whence' and the 'whither,' will be the absorbing questions of interest to mankind. And it is in the great congregation where heart beats with heart in concord and breaths conspire, where common belief and common experiences draw the children of toil and pain into close dear fellowships of sympathy and hope, that the answer will best be given, and the man who can utter it will be most lovingly heard. There is a power in public worship, in the utterance of common sorrows, needs, and hopes, in the prayer that is breathed, and the praise that is sung in concert, not with the crowd that fills the sanctuary, but with the innumerable company of all lands and ages, who have drunk of the same spring and gone straight on their way, which they strangely miss who teach that worship is a worn-out superstition, and that only in the clear light of law can men walk and be blest. While man sins and suffers, while there is blood-tinged sweat upon His brow, while there is weeping in His home, and anguish in His heart, that voice can never lose its music, which brings forth the comfort and inspiration of the Gospel, which tells the sin-tormented spirit the tale of the Infinite Pity, and bids it lay its sobbing wretchedness to rest on the bosom of the Infinite Love."

Professors Tyndal and Huxley on the Soul:—"We cannot mentally visualize the soul as an entity distinct from the body, and the very use of the term soul is therefore unscientific. From the side of science all that we are warranted in stating is that terror, hope, sensation and calculation are physical phenomena, produced by or associated with the molecular processes, set up by waves of light in a previously prepared brain." (Professor Tyndal's lecture on Science and Man.) When Professor Tyndal is asked what is the causal connection between these molecular motions and states of consciousness, he says, "My answer is: I do not see the connection, nor have I as yet met anybody who does. If we are true to the canons of science we must deny to subjective phenomena all influence on physical process." Again. "If you are content to make your 'soul' a poetic rendering of a phenomenon, which refuses the yoke of ordinary physical laws, I, for one, would not object to this exercise of ideality." (See "Quarterly Review" for January, page 43.) "It is difficult to say," observes the Reviewer, "whether the incoherence or the presumption of this argument is the more surprising."

"A nucleated mass of Protoplasm turns out to be what may be termed the structural unit of the human body. As a matter of fact the body in its earliest state is a mere multiple of such units; and in its perfect condition it is a multiple of such units variously modified. All vital action may with equal propriety be said to be the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm which displays it. What justification is there then for the assumption of the existence in the living matter of a something, which has no representative or correlative in the non-living matter which gives rise to it?"—Huxley: See "Edinburgh Review," April, 1878, page 359.

* Rev. Baldwin Brown in "XIXth Century Review."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 28, 1880.

OUR correspondent "R. G." need not hesitate to criticise any statements we make. We have no pretentions to be considered theologians, and, even if we had, we should not wish to be looked upon as infallible. We gladly welcome any and every correction of our views: our sole object is the discussion and, as far as possible, the attainment and dissemination of the Truth. We may have mistaken the meaning of St. Paul's language in Philippians iii. 8; but we scarcely think a careful consideration of the context will warrant the meaning "R. G." attaches to the words "the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jess." Whatever may be the strict and literal meaning of St. Paul in this passage, we are in accord with "R. G." in believing that we ought to groun our opinions and practice on the Gospels ratherthan on the Epistles of the New Testament. Our correspondent's second objection raises the main question, which we deem to be of the highest possible moment to the whole Gentile world, and wich we

accordingly desire to see canvassed by our ablest and most learned theologians—"Did the 'everlasting covenant' and its token refer to (or rather concern) the Jews only?" We may remind "R. G." that this "everlasting covenant" of Faith and its token, Circumcision, was made with Abraham and his seed four hundred and thirty years before the Mosaic Ceremonial Law was instituted. True, the token as a ceremony was confirmed and incorporated in that Law, and if our correspondent will show that it was a mere type like the other ceremonies of the Law, we should the more readily believe that it was abrogated, or rather "fulfilled" by the advent of Christ, the Great Antitype. We are taught by St. Paul to believe that we are all spiritual, if not carnal, sons of faithful Abraham, and ought to be participators in the covenant of faith made with him and his seed for ever. We doubt whether we are justified, in the absence of any formal and express injunction, in neglecting the token or sacrament of that great Covenant, especially when experience proves that Circumcision promotes the health and salvation of the body, and we know that the moral faculties of Faith, Hope, and Charity depend in no small degree on the health of the body, and we are assured that it was the design of our Saviour to redeem and save the bodies as well as the souls of men. St. Paul's teaching on this subject was directed not so much against Circumcision itself as against those who trusted in the rite without heeding the covenant of which it was a token: just as there are Christians who attach importance to the mere ceremony of Baptism, without regarding the agreement of which it is the seal or token.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE LORD'S DAY.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I am surprised that no remarks have been drawn from your correspondents by the paper on "Sabbath Observance," which appeared in your issue of June 19th. Many doubtless are interested deeply in that subject, yet I imagine many differ from the Rev. J. Bardsley. Will you allow me to state briefly,—1. What appear to me grounds for an observance of the Lord's Day. 2. Why I do not agree with Rev. J. Bardsley.

I. (a). It is clear that Christians should meet together at stated times to honour God, testify their belief in Him, and seek His aid. The first day of the week has been used for this purpose from the first establishment of Christianity, therefore it would be presumptuous in a Church or individual to attempt to make any change in this without very good reason.

(b). Experience shows it to be most advantageous to body and mind, to have one day in seven as a day of rest from the toil and labour of the week.

(c). Experience of all who are seeking to lead Godly lives, also shows it most beneficial, to have one day set apart for more special consideration of the soul's welfare, to direct our thoughts more than daily to God, Christ, and the Life to come.

(d). It is, for this last reason, most desirable to spend this day, as far as possible, in the manner described by Bishop Hall as quoted by Rev. J. Bardsley.

II. The attempt to rest the observance of the First day of the week directly on the fourth Commandment appears to be a mistake, for the following reasons:

(a). Because we never find the Apostles referring to it as a reason why Gentile Christians, or any Christians, should observe the first or any day of the week.

(b). Because when a question was raised touching the connection of Gentile Christians with the law of Moses, and when it was decided that they need not carry that yoke, no exception of the fourth Commandment was made. (See Acts xv.)

(c). Because St. Paul teaches us that we should not let persons judge us in respect of "the Sabbath," Co ii, 16., which we conclude he would not have said if he considered all bound by God's express law in the fourth Commandment: To keep the Sabbath day. The teaching in Col. iv, 10 and Romans xiv, 5, are to the same effect.

(d). Mr. Bardsley's opinion, that "the change of day was made by the express command of the Saviour to His apostles previous to His Ascension is subsequently revealed," meaning thereby that Apostolic Christians were taught that they should take the fourth commandment, touching the seventh day, as teaching them God's will regarding the first day—seems to me a very strange opinion, without any grounds whatever to go upon, a very round about and confusing way of securing the observance of the first day of the week, such as our mere imagination ought not to ascribe to the highest wisdom.

(e). The Sabbath I conceive is not a part of the moral law in the sense in which Mr. Bardsley would make out. By *Moral* is usually meant, that which commends itself to us as right without any express command of God, that which is moral we should obey without any command; to worship God is a moral duty, to worship *Him in public* on every fourth day, or seventh day, or tenth, is not a moral but ceremonial duty. The fourth commandment was a moral one as far as it taught God to be honoured and worshipped; that moral duty shall be attended to, as far as the fourth commandment enjoined a special day to be observed, it enjoined what is ceremonial. This was the teaching of many of the Reformers on this subject. Cranmer says: "There be two parts of the sabbath day, the one is the outward bodily rest from all manner of labour and work, and this is mere ceremonial, and was taken away by Christ with other sacrifices and ceremonies at the preaching of the Gospel; the other part of the sabbath day is the universal rest in ceasing from sin, from our own will and lusts, and to do only God's will and commandments. This spiritual sabbath, that is to abstain from sin and do good, are all men bound to keep *all the days of their life*." My duty towards God in the Catechism seems to gather this last alone out of the fourth commandment, as the part of Christians. I must not trespass more than to add what the Augsburg Confession says, "They who think the observance of the Lord's day has been appointed by the authority of the Church instead of the sabbath as a thing necessary greatly err. The Scripture allows that we are not bound to keep the sabbath day, for it teaches that the ceremonies of the law of Moses are not necessary after the Revelation of the Gospel, and yet because it was necessary to appoint a

certain day that the people might know when to assemble together it appears that the Church appointed for this purpose the Lord's day."

RICHARD GALBRAITH, M.A.

—:o:—

ADDRESS OF THANKS TO THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

SIR,—One word respecting the proposed "Address" to the Bishop of Lincoln, if you can kindly find space for its insertion, not *later* than the issue for next week.

The Address was originally issued by its framer, the Bishop of Nottingham, to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln, and, with over six hundred signatures attached, was presented on July 14th.

The present is in substance the same. The promoters do not ask for any assistance in meeting the necessary expenses attached to the movement, but it is open to well-wishers of the Bishop of Lincoln, as intimated in the *Guardian* this week, if disposed to manifest their sympathy and support in a more practical way, to contribute sums, say of 2s. 6d. and upwards, towards the establishment of the Bishopric of Southwell, as a means of relieving the Bishop of Lincoln and his Suffragan from that pressure of duties which, by a natural paradox, tends to cripple their usefulness outside the County and Diocese of Lincoln, and therefore in the Church at large.

G. E. WATKINS.

Standford-le-hope, Aug. 21st, 1880.

SIR,—I beg to inform you that I have now received communications from nearly a thousand of the Clergy of the Church of England, desirous of joining in the presentation of a vote of thanks to the Bishop of Lincoln, offered in the first place by the Clergy of his lordship's own diocese, in grateful acknowledgment of his noble speech in the House of Lords with respect to the Burials Bill.

Signatures are in the act of being added daily to the long roll of names, and I shall still be glad to receive these until the last day of the present month, when this supplemental Address, prepared with the same care as the first, will be presented to the Bishop of Lincoln with all due respect.

E. NOTTINGHAM.

Leasingham, Sleaford, August 16th, 1880.

SIR,—In a letter published in the *Guardian* last week, the Rev. F. W. Peel makes a very practical suggestion.

He recommends that the memorial about to be presented to the Bishop of Lincoln, thanking him for his courageous action in the House of Lords with reference to the proposed "Burials Bill," should "assume a more substantial form than mere names," and that that form should be a pecuniary one.

As a suitable object for the contributions of those who wish thus to mark their grateful sense of his lordship's conduct, Mr. Peel suggests the "Southwell Bishopric Endowment Fund."

Without for a moment questioning the importance of the establishment of this bishopric at an early date, so as to relieve the present and all future Bishops of Lincoln, as well as the Bishops of Lithfield, of labour too large to be adequately fulfilled, permit me to say that there is another object equally important for the efficiency of the Church, with which the honoured name of Bishop Wordsworth is far more intimately connected, which at the present time is in urgent need of funds for its completion—viz., the "*Scholæ Cancellarii*," or Chancellor's Theological Schools for training candidates for holy orders at Lincoln.

It will be seen by a statement in another part of this paper that the Bishop of Lincoln has, with almost unexampled munificence, already given the very large sum of between seven and eight thousand pounds for the purchase of suitable premises and the erection of lecture-rooms for the students, and that three thousand pounds more are required to pay for the adaptation of the buildings purchased to their new purpose. Of this sum fifteen hundred pounds are already forthcoming. The other fifteen hundred are in course of being raised. It is very desirable that the whole sum should be completed before October 1st, the day fixed for the dedictation of the new institution.

If thus to aid in carrying out the plan rendered possible by the large-handed generosity of the Bishop of Lincoln seems to any a suitable mode of testifying their sense of his lordship's labours for the Church, I am permitted to say that the Sub-Dean of Lincoln (Canon Clements, "the Sub-Deanery") will thankfully receive any donations, either small or large, for this purpose.

EDMUND VENABLES.

The Precentory, Lincoln, August 21, 1880.

—o—

CIRCUMCISION.

SIR,—I trust you will pardon me for saying that some things in your last leading article appear to me open to very grave question. Let me notice two:

First—The assertion that "if we did act up to St. Paul's saying and example in Phillippians iii. 8, we should utterly neglect our duties as individual citizens." Is that not a mistake? Does not a portion of "the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus" consist in knowing His will concerning our conduct in every relation of life? He surely desires all to fulfil their duties as citizens (see Rev. J. Vaughan's sermon in your last), therefore those who most closely follow St. Paul's example will be the best citizens.

Second—Did not the "everlasting covenant" refer to the Jews only?

Did not St. Paul's teaching at least show that *he* did not for a moment suypose that our Lord's example and saying "I am not come to destroy," &c., meant that Gentile Christian should follow the rite of Circumcision, and the other ceremonies of the Law? And if we suppose St. Paul was mistaken, and that our Lord's saying was to be taken as your article seems to suppose, should not all Christians obey every particular of the Jewish law and ritual?

Without controverting any of the facts stated by Dr. Gibbon regarding the superior health of the Jews. It would, I think, be most interesting and practically useful, if the opinions of a large number of medical men could be obtained on this subject. Are most of them of opinion that such a superiority arises from Circumcision?

R. G.

SIR,—If the discussion of the posibilities of Circumcision from a moral and sanitary point of view, should lead churchmen to a stricter observance of the Feast of the Circumcision, it will independently of the question of discipline for flesh and spirit, have proved useful to the Church. I think the strongest ground on which the practice could be supported among Christians—especially in the East—would be the fact of our Lord's submitting to it, and the absence of any injunction in

Scripture, *not* to give that rite its due weight, both as a legal precedent set us by our Lord, and as a probable *moral* safeguard amongst the church people.

G. E. W.

SIR,—As regards Circumcision, as far as a mere cursory thought goes, for I have not given it full consideration, the great argument of St. Paul against it is against the placing any confidence in it as a rite any longer pleasing to God, as a *religious rite*, which those to whom he was writing, the Judaizers, were doing. Circumcision in this sense was abrogated, and it was no longer necessary that anyone who was not already Circumcised should be Circumcised. Otherwise they would have to keep that law of which Circumcision was the chief mark so to speak, in fact it was with him a religious question, not a physical one, two entirely distinct things: and his great point to make was, against the Judaizers, that Circumcision was no longer necessary for any Gentile converts on religious grounds, and not only that it was not necessary, but that as a religious rite it was done away with, a very hard thing for Jews to believe, hence his very strong language on the point.

G. T.

TEETOTALISM.

SIR,—No one, I should think, can have read the statistics on drunkenness which appeared in last Friday's *Times* without feeling at least interested, and I hope seriously interested, in the great question as to how best to remedy this terrible evil. I hope Mr. White, who writes on the Temperance Question in your last issue, has pondered well these statistics; they are very heartrending to read, and perhaps the two features in these figures which are the most sad are: (1) The early age at which convictions for drunkenness take place, and (2) The large proportion of females who come under the power of this awful sin. Surely any true patriot ought to weigh these matters well, and to do all in his power to remedy such an increasing evil. Well, how is it to be remedied? Mr. White is "opposed to the practice of Total Abstinence." Has he ever asked himself whether there is any other cure? Suppose I go to a confirmed drunkard, what shall I say to him? Shall I approach him with the words, my good fellow, I want you for the sake of your own soul, and the welfare of your wife and children, to drink less; I don't want you to give up alcohol entirely, "because it is God's gift to man," &c.? What does a drunkard know about moderation? Is it not evident that Total Abstinence is the only cure for these confirmed drinkers? Then again, when I go to such men and try to reform them, how shall I better succeed than by telling them that I can get on very well without drinking beer or wine? Mr. White quotes the old stock passages in Scripture as to the non-advocacy of Total Abstinence; they are so worn out by frequent use, that I wonder our friends do not adopt other plans of defence. I quite agree with him in saying the "moderate use of wine is not in itself a sin." Who, in his senses, ever said it was? And Mr. White very kindly agrees to "scarcely consider their conduct a sin" who are Total Abstainers. It is very kind of him to say so, but by using the word "scarcely" perhaps he is not quite sure on the point! I am a teetotaller, and have been for three years, nor do I in the least regret the step I took. For the sake of example as a clergyman in the parish, I said at a crowded meeting in our Town Hall, when Mr. King so ably and eloquently advocated Total Abstinence, that if others would follow my example I would try it for six months. At once a large number came forward. The six months passed by, and feeling none the worse for my leaving off my beer and wine, I agreed to prolong my Total Abstinence indefinitely. Can one work without alcohol? I have had my share of work here, in this large scattered parish—eight miles in length—with five churches to serve, and only three priests, with as many as ten and eleven services every Sunday, to one of which I have to walk there and back, some five miles. During the four years I have been here I have preached no less than six hundred and forty-three sermons. We are constantly at work, and with our five churches we can seldom get two Sundays' rest during the year. Now I find that I can walk with less fatigue on water than I could on beer. I may also state that not only is it possible to work without stimulants, but I want to point out what a mighty safeguard it is for a clergyman, and from what numberless remarks and suspicions he is free, if he be a teetotaller. I have been called a "heretic," I have been classed with the followers of Mauer. I have been told that I am leaning on the "crutch for cripples," because I drink nothing intoxicating; but calling names injures nobody, and if by my example I can do anything, however small, to rescue my countrymen from this terrible curse of drink, which is slowly ruining England, I shall be content. I am no bigot. I hope I am charitable enough to refrain from "judging others who may differ from me in practice." I advocate Teetotalism, not because it is the "summum bonum" of the Christian life, not because there is any real harm in taking intoxicating drinks. I advocate it simply on the score of its being a power for good. What did that noble patriotic St. Paul say? "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." Let us take care lest by our very moderate drinking we "make our brother to offend."

ARTHUR R. BARTLETT.

The Chantry, Berkeley.

SIR,—I am glad that this subject has been brought forward in your paper. It needs publicity, especially by means of the religious press. The point at issue is not whether the Bible teaches total-abstinence or not, but what is the best means of stopping drunkeness among our fellow countrymen. The Bible favours total-abstinence although it does not enforce it. He was a total-abstainer of whom Christ said, "Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist."

Abstainers and non-abstainers must be agreed that it is time something should be done, and if they do not "see eye to eye," they should at least be united in fighting against intemperance. This is a work in which all the clergy of the Church should be engaged. Their independent position gives them facilities for doing the work in a way that others cannot. And let them remember that if they neglect it, others will be raised up to do it. The false ideas that prevail on this subject would not nearly have been so common if the clergy had not for the most part left temperance work in the hands of ignorant fanatics.

The battle will chiefly have to be fought with the young. It is known how difficult it is to reform a drunkard, and it is also difficult to get a "moderate drinker" to become an abstainer; therefore on these grounds the work makes little progress. But let the children be brought up without taking "strong drink" and they will not feel the want of it, and in

most cases they will be better in health and morals. Juvenile branches of the Church of England Temperance Society should be established in every parish in the country. This work will call forth much self-denial, but that is the true spirit of Christianity. And it is a point which is often forgotten in this luxurious age. All Christians, and especially the clergy, should make St. Paul's teaching their rule of acting in reference to this subject. "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is made weak." There can be no question that "strong drink" is a great stumbling-block to many, therefore earnest Christians should as much as lies in their power discourage its use, whatever self-denial it may involve.

August, 21 1880. HENRY G. HIRD, B.A.

:o:

PARENTAL INFLUENCE.

SIR,—Allow me to draw the attention of your readers to the Introduction to Sermons on "Christian Faith and Character," by the late Archbishop Sumner, meeting —as the Introduction of the Archbishop does—the views expressed by your correspondents on the sad failure of many young fellows when they leave their home.

I hope you may be able to reprint the following extracts from this Introduction in the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT. The words of so good a man may direct and correct the efforts of fathers and mothers.

SABRINA.

"No man will go through life, no sensible parent allow his child to enter into life, with vague and undefined notions upon the subject of religion. To be careless, or to be ignorant, in a matter of such unspeakable importance, is the most inexcusable error where it is wilful, and the most unhappy condition where it is unavoidable. . . . The ignorance which prevails on the true nature of Christianity may be traced, in great measure, to the irregular and unmethodical manner in which religious instruction is frequently conveyed, and which is so unlike the strict preparatory discipline to which the converts of the early ages were subjected. That which is understood to be the great secret of education, the leading the pupil on by a gradual progress in which no step is omitted, no advance made till the preliminary information is attained —this is entirely neglected in the communication of religious knowledge, except in the case of peculiar attention and care. For that excellent summary, the Church Catechism, does not contain in itself a connected view of the Christian faith, but is rather a recapitulation of what is supposed to have been learnt elsewhere. And sermons, which afford the next chance of instruction to the young Christian, necessarily take it for granted that a great deal is understood by the hearer, which many, probably, do not understand, and for want of which much important truth fails of its effect, and loses its value. They give no opportunity for inquiring into what is imperfectly known or comprehended; nor has the preacher always the means of ascertaining what is and what is not profitable, or how far the individuals whom he addresses are capable of receiving his instruction.

"The Bible indeed is in the hands or within the reach of every one; and if properly studied would *guide them into all truth*. But some awakening stimulus is necessary in order to induce the young and gay to read the Bible; neither can we pretend to be ignorant how much it is, in fact, neglected, by those especially who belong to the higher ranks of society. Besides, even the Bible itself does not supersede other teaching; because, from the nature of the Sacred Writings, its truths and precepts are generally delivered in a narrative, or at least an unconnected form, so that both their relation to one another, and their indivvidual application, may often remain unperceived.

"From these and other impediments, added to the natural distaste for religious inquiry, the Christian too often grows up with very little clear or profitable knowledge of the religion to which he nominally belongs, and for which he has, perhaps, a sincere, though ignorant, respect. But it cannot be expected that so vague an idea of the nature or obligations of Christianity, should enable him to oppose the corruption by which he is betrayed, and the temptations by which he is surrounded. It is too probable that he may fall into a course of carelessness or sinfulness, which may lead him to wish revelation untrue, the preparatory step to believing that it is untrue, and consequently to neglecting it altogether. At all events he is in a vacillating, uncertain state, extremely unsatisfactory to his own mind whenever he reflects, extremely unsatisfactory to all those who reflect for him, and consider the New Testament as a definite revelation of the will of God, and Baptism as a covenant which a man must ratify, if he is to be profited by it, and which he cannot ratify without understanding its conditions."

Reviews and Notices.

"HINTS TO PREACHERS; WITH SERMONS AND ADDRESSES." By S. Reynolds Hole, Canon of Lincoln. Oxford and London: James Parker and Co. 1880. p.p. 454.

The title of this work raises expectations which are not realised on perusal. "Hints to Preachers" occupy but ten pages and a half, while the remainder of the book consists of twenty-seven sermons and six addresses from the pen of the author, who, as is clear from the wording of his preface, and from that of the note prefixed to the opening sermon of the series, felt that in publishing them he ran the risk of exposure to unfavourable criticism. "I wish to anticipate and hope to dispel the suspicion that these "Hints to preachers," are but the pretext of a conceited writer who wishes to see his sermons in print. The Book is published because I I have been told, and because I believe, that the result of my experience in the matter of preaching may by God's blessing be useful to others." . . . "I trust that I am not influenced by 'that worst of all pride—the pride which apes humility,' when I say of the sermons which are to follow as illustrations of the 'Hints to preachers,' that, as regards originality of thought or cleverness in composition, their merits are very small; but I publish them all the more confidently because their imperfections confirm my argument that a sermon carefully prepared and earnestly preached without book, will impress large congregations, without any special talent in him who preaches." It is it be regretted that when the writer of those words undertook to furnish "*hints*" to his bretheren, upon the subject of pulpit-ministration he did not supply more useful "*illustrations*" in connexion with them, and also that his "*Hints*" and no more numerous, and his "*illustrations*" fewer and more condensed. Although there be a commendable simplicity and earnestness in Canon Hole's style of sermon composition, it is too discussive and scraps of hymnody and other verses are much too frequently introduced. Referring in section eight to the

importance of giving due attention to the management of the voice in the delivery of sermons, the writer has truly observed; "the preacher always bringing his best to God, must not only study his words carefully but their devout and appropriate utterance also. The varied intonations of his voice should be as lights and shades upon a landscape, or as the touches of a skilled musician on an instrument, and a good sermon, drawled in a monotone, is a fair scene upon a cold, cloudy day, or a Sonata of Beethoven practised by a learner who does not feel its power." Prehaps as the author named his book, "Hints to *Preachers*, with *Sermons* and *Addresses*, he did not regard it as being within the scope of his design to make allusion to the subject of Liturgical reading. In that department of church-ministrations a vast number of the clergy are quite as much at fault, as when they enter the pulpit. Any, even the least, attempt at elocutionary display at what is sometimes called "fine reading," is highly objectionable, but many who are not chargeable with making such attempt are blameable in other respects. Either by drawling through the services, or by unseemly rapidity of utterance, or by reading the words of the Prayer Book in a perfunctory and therefore irreverent tone, they leave themselves open to the charge of neglecting to impress those who hear them with the momentous importance, and intense solemnity of the act of approaching "the Throne of heavenly Grace."

It was once said of the privilege of membership with a Church professing a ritual such as ours, that if the people often get nothing but *chaff* from the *pulpit*, they always get plenty of the finest *wheat flour* from the *desk*, but it is lamentable to think how seldom the spiritually nutritive value of the "wheat-flour" is practically recognised by those ministering in her congregations. Many preachers would do well to act upon the counsel given in the introductory part of this work, (which although, as already remarked, not realizing the expectations raised by its title, contains some valuable advice) namely, that they should know when to conclude. "Let the preacher remember Eutychus, and think how often he has heard it sighed concerning his brethren, 'if they only knew where to stop.'" . . . "Signs of weariness should be to a preacher as a bugle-call to cease firing. Long sermons are only justified when people come specially to hear them, and they should never be preceded or followed by long services."

The Calcutta *Statesman* is informed that the Church Missionary Society intend to close one of their institutions at Allahabad—St. Peter's College.

The Rev. J. W. Horsley, chaplain of Clerkenwell Prison, has been appointed Sunday Evening Lecturer at SS. Michael and All Angels', Chiswick.

We hear with satisfaction that the Crown living of Kingswear, Devon, has, upon the recommendation of Mr. Gladstone, been presented to the Rev. Frederick Walker, late curate of Little Eaton, Derbyshire. Mr. Walker is a son of the late vicar of Bardney, Lincolnshire, and holds Evangelical views.

Mr. William Hancocks, of Blakeshall House, near Kidderminster, has lately added to many former acts of liberality and munificience a gift of £1,000 to the endowment of Cookley Church, near Kidderminster, of which he is the patron. This money has been lodged with the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who will pay the interest of it yearly to the incumbent, and will add an equal sum annually to meet it from their own fund.

We have from time to time recorded in our columns the gradual growth of the Scholæ Cancellarii, Lincoln, revived seven years since by the present Bishop of Truro, Dr. Benson, when Chancellor of Lincoln, as a part of the statutable functions of his office, and carried on with ever-increasing success by him and his successor, Chancellor Leeke, and the efficient staff that has been created there. We have now to announce that, through the noble munificence of the Bishop of Lincoln, a most important step towards securing the premanence and efficiency of the theological school has been taken in the purchase of the extensive range of buildings formerly serving as the County Hospital, and their adaptation to the reception of students. For the last two years a portion of the students have enjoyed the advantages of collegiate life in the old "Bishop's Hostel," a large gentleman's residence, which had been purchased by the Bishop and presented as a free gift to the "Scholæ," the opening services of which were recorded at the time in our columns. The social, moral, and spiritual influences of the common life in the hostel has proved of the highest benefit to the students, and the desire has been strengthened that it might be possible to obtain a building of sufficient dimensions to admit the whole body of students to collegiate life as the most effectual step towards the further progress and permanent establishment of the institution. This, which, not so very long since, appeared little more than a remote possibility, has now been secured by the munificence of the Bishop of Lincoln, who has purchased the premises of the old County Hospital, vacated on the erection of the new hospital two years since, for the use of the "Scholæ." The sum devoted by the Bishop to this purpose, including that spent by him on the restoration of the "Alnwick Tower" of the Old Palace, as lecture-rooms for the students, and the purchase of the former "Bishop's Hostel," represents a total free gift of about £7,700. To adapt the old hospital for the reception of students an outlay not far short of £3,000 has been needed. Towards this, through the careful husbanding of the funds of the "Scholæ," augumented by some liberal gifts, at the first commencement of the scheme, by Dr. Benson, a sum of £1,500 is in hand. An additional sum of £1,500 is needed to enable the Chancellor to pay for the alterations, and start the building clear of debt, as, in the Bishop's own words, "a work not for this generation only, nor only for the diocese of Lincoln, but for all generations and for the Church at large." The new "Bishop's Hostel" comprises rooms for thirty-two students, together with a chapel, a refectory, a library which will serve as a common sitting-room, and all necessary domestic offices, as well as a residence for the Vice-Chancellor and a set of rooms for the tutor The situation is a noble one, on the summit of the hill overlooking the wide plain of Nottinghamshire, in the immediate vicinity of the cathedral and the lecture rooms at the Old Palace. The day fixed for the formal opening of the building is October 1st. The services of the day will consist of an early celebration of Holy Communion, a service of dedication, and Evensong in the cathedral, at which a sermon will be preached by the Bishop of Truro. In his last Visitation Charge the Bishop spoke of "the accomplishment of this design" as "much to be desired." This has now been secured by the Bishop's princely munificence. May we not hope, especially at such a time as the present, that the example of so noble a champion of the Church will find many worthy imitators?

The Rev. R. Appleton, M.A., Fellow and Assistant-Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge, has been appointed by the Bishop of Durham to be one of his examining chaplains. Mr. Appleton, in addition to the discharge of his academic duties, has for seven years past been superintendent of the Jesus-lane Sunday-school, which is taught by, altogether, upwards of a hundred University men. In this post he has displayed most self-denying zeal, and has developed in a remarkable manner its great opportunities for usefulness both as regards the scholars, the University men who teach, and the general influence which it gives. He was also examiner in the last Theological Tripos, and will examine again in the next. It is interesting to notice that there will be no less than four examining chaplains among the resident Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge:—The Rev. R. Appleton, assistant-tutor, examining chaplain to the Bishop of Durham; the Rev. A. F. Kirkpatrick, assistant-tutor and Junior Dean, examining chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester; the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, formerly Senior Dean, who is expected to return into residence next term, recently appointed examining chaplain to the Bishop of Liverpool; the Rev. V. H. Stanton, Senior Dean, examining chaplain to the Bishop of Ely. Among non-resident Fellows is to be added the Rev. Canon Mason, examining chaplain to the Bishop of Truro, missioner in that diocese.

The three curates of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, the Revs. H. Hill, H. P. Fraser, and C. E. Le Geyt, having expressed a desire that they might be allowed to relinquish their engagements, Bishop Ryan has complied with their request, and all three gentlemen have resigned. The necessary appointments will be speedily made, and it is understood that the Rev. F. A. Lambert, curate of All Saints, Eastbourne, who previously held office under Bishop Ryan, has been selected as one of the new curates. It is stated that the new vicar does not contemplate making any great alteration in the services of St. Peter's, except in the case of strictly illegal ceremonies or practices.—*Salisbury Journal.*

Preaching on Sunday at St. Thomas's, Manchester, Bishop Fraser said there had been a great discussion in the religious papers, and the ecclesiastical world was agitated from top to bottom, because a patron in the south of England, stretching his right to the full length of his tether, and going further than he (the Bishop) thought a patron was justified in doing, had set over a congregation in Bournemouth one who they thought would upset all that had been done before:—It was a question of the administration of the Holy Communion with lighted candles, mixing water with the wine, and the singing of the *Agnus Dei* in connection with the Communion Office. All those things were perfectly harmless in themselves, but they had been declared to be illegal in the Church of England; that was to say, the Church had not ordered them, and no minister had a right to order them in the exercise of his own free mind. To upset a congregation, and agitate the Church from one end of it to the other, about matters of that kind seemed to him to be an inconceivable folly in face of those great problems with which they had to deal. Who was better in soul for it? He might look at it as a matter of taste; but who would say that his soul was one bit lifted nearer to God because a pair of lighted wax candles were on the Holy Table during the administration of the Sacrament? Those things would be contemptible if they were not so serious, and to see a great Church which God had given a great and solid work to do wasting time and energy upon such matters made him weep, and almost reminded him of the proverb that when God meant to destroy a nation, or a Church, or an individual, He first took away his sane mind. They were things that were enough to make wise men weep, and what they needed was to have more of the mind of Christ and more of the spirit of Christianity.

The Bishop of Lincoln has received letters from the Greek Archbishop of Smyrna (the successor of St. Polycarp) and from the American Archbishop in Smyrna, by the hands of the Rev. James Dombrain, late British chaplain in Smyrna, and now rector of Sotby, Lincolnshire. In those letters the two Archbishops express sentiments of respect and affection for the Church of England, and ask for her sisterly sympathy and co-operation.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bainbrigge, Rev. P. T., curate of Leicester; sole charge of St. Philip's, Regent Street.
Blunt, Rev. William O., rector of Chester-le-Street; rural dean of Chester-le-Street Deanery.
Edwardes, Rev. John Scandrett, senior curate of Waddesdon, Bucks; curate of St. John and St. Mary, Brecknock.
Fry, Rev. James Henry, curate-in-charge of Pebmarsh, Essex.
Gawn, Rev. J. Douglas, curate of Alvaston and Boulton, residing at Allenton, Derby.
Goodrick, Rev. John Gray, vicar of Bulford, Wilts.
Gorton, Rev. Charles Reynolds, vicar of Walesby, Notts.
Hawkins, Rev. William Webster, vicar of Hensall-cum-Heck.
Heard, Rev. John Bickford, rector of Woldingham.
Holcroft, Rev. Thomas Austen, vicar of Mitford.
Howard, Rev. John, curate of Pulham St. Mary, Norfolk; vicar of Great Plumstead, Norwich.
Hunt, Rev. Alfred Leedes, vicar of Christ Church, St. George-in-the-East.
Hunter, Rev. J. W., incumbent of St. Mary Magdalene's, Dundee; Incumbent of St. Mary's, Dunkeld.
Iggulden, Rev. W. H., vicar of St. Luke's, Jersey; warden of Browne's Hospital, Stamford.
Ingham, Rev. Ernest Graham, vicar of St. Matthew, Leeds.
Kearney, Rev. Neville, rector of Croghan, co. Roscommon; prebendary of Kilmacallan in Elphin Cathedral.
King, Rev. Robert Turner, vicar of Friday Bridge, near Wisbech.
James, Rev. Edward George, vicar of Thornham, Kent; rector of Chorley, Lancashire.
Master, Rev. Gilbert Coventry, rector of Chorley, Lancashire; vicar of Thornham, Kent.
Midwinter, Rev. E. A., assistant-chaplain to the Lock Hospital; vicar of St. Paul's, Lisson-grove.
Morgan, Rev. H. D., rector of Tidmarsh.
Pakes, Rev. Charles, vicar of Copp, Great Eccleston.
Vallings, Rev. J. F., sub-warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury.
Walker, Rev. F., curate of Little Eaton, Derbyshire; vicar of Kingswear, Devon.
Wright, Ven. Henry Press, Camb., rector of Greatham, Hants.
Yeatman, Rev. Huyshe, vicar of St. Batholomew's, Sydenham; surrogate of Rochester.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cooper, Rev. Rowland Helme, rector of Eastleach Martin and vicar of Eastleach Turville, Bonthorp, on the 17th inst., aged 89.
Cookesley, Rev. William Gifford, rector of Tempsford, Beds, and formerly Assistant-Master of Eton College, at Tempsford rectory, on the 16th inst., aged 77.
Maude, Rev. Ralph, formerly vicar of Mirfield, Yorkshire, Lytham, on the 15th inst., aged 81.
Tomlinson, Rev. Edward, rector of Hope and Shelve, Salop, on the 9th inst., at Hanwood Villa, near Shrewsbury.
Wright, Rev. Henry, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Honorary Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and Minister of St. John's Chapel, Hampstead, drowned whilst bathing in Coniston Lake, on the 13th inst., aged 47.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD.

By the Rev. W. J. HALL, M.A.,
Rector of St. Clement's, Eastcheap, with St. Martin's, Orgar, and
Minor Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral.

"I am the Light of the World."—St. John viii. 12.

BLESSED as we are with the knowledge of Christianity, nursed as we have been in the arms of faith, natural to us as seem the great dogmas of the Immortality of the soul, of the Resurrection of the body, of the Judgment to come, we frequently fail to perceive how exclusively we are indebted for our belief in these things to the Divine founder of our religion. We have lived so long in the sunshine of the presence of Him who is the Light of the World, that we have forgotten the darkness in which mankind originally dwelt; and we are perhaps tempted to imagine that by the exercise of the mere human intellect and conscience a dawn at least, if not a noon-tide brightness, of spiritual enlightenment might have broken upon us. How vain such a supposition is, how entirely we owe all our faith and hope to our Lord Jesus Christ, how supremely momentous His advent was in its bearing on the human race, I shall endeavour this morning to show you.

Now, when a man begins to reflect seriously on the problem of his own existence, he is brought face to face with these four questions: 1. What am I? 2. Whence am I? 3. For what purpose am I here? 4. Whither am I going?—And in order to obtain an answer to these questions he can appeal to two sources, to the phenomena of Nature, and to the declarations of Revelation. Let us consider the reply which each gives.

1. To the question, "What am I?" Nature answers thus: "You are one among the other animals inhabiting this earth, and, as you flatter yourself, superior to all. But you are weaker than many of those you despise, and your natural ingenuity is far inferior to theirs You are less able to provide for yourself, less independent then the dog who looks up to you. You are unarmed and can defend yourself only by your craftiness. The might of that intellect of which you boast is unable to preserve that which you prize above all things, your life. Compared with the existence of the comet, which though travelling at inconceivable speed takes eight thousand years to perform one revolution round the sun; compared with the duration of the rocks on which you tread, your time here on earth is but as a moment, of which you cannot say it is here, ere it is gone. In respect of the bulk of the universe you are of no more importance or account than the minutest grain of sand. And yet you, poor, insignificant, unnecessary creature, go mourning all the day long, full of regret, pain, and anxiety. *What* are you? Why, an atom in space, a little bubble on the ocean of existence which bursts as soon as it is formed!"

Such an answer as this, and only such an answer as this, can Nature give to man's question, "What am I?" The reply that Jesus, the Light of the World, offers to the same question is wholly different. "What are you? You are an immortal soul, prisoned for a while within walls of flesh and blood, but yet immortal. All material things may perish and yet you shall stand. Your eternal nature is a thing grander and nobler than anything cognizable by human senses; so much so that it may be justly asked, 'What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' The exchange would not be equal. One immortal soul is worth more than circling myriads of perishable worlds. Nay more than this! So priceless is the value of your never-ending life, that to preserve it God the Son came down from heaven and taking your nature into his own reconciled you to the Father. You are not now merely God's creature, subject to the general laws of his providence, but your nature is for ever bound up with the nature of the Eternal, you and He are one in Christ." Yes! Lord Jesus! Thou art the Light of the World! Thou hast taught us that we are not as the beasts that perish.

2. The second question which meets us when reflecting upon the fact of our own existence is this: "*Whence* am I?" And if we interrogate Nature upon this point, we find her as silent as she is upon her own history. A philosopher of old was asked, from whence came all things? He answered, "from chaos." But when he was further pressed thus:—"And whence came chaos?" he had nothing to reply. And so when man appeals to Nature for an account of the origin of his being, he is met with an appalling silence. And naturally so; for how should matter teach spirit, or the irrational instruct the rational? Modern speculation (I do not call it science) has indeed pretended to give an account of the origin of man. He is described by it as developing himself from some lower form of being, nay from the lowest form of animal being; and if so his highest and noblest thoughts, his grandest aspirations, are nothing but the product of matter, nothing but the result of physical development. Thought, imagination, genius, piety, virtue, depend according to this theory upon the chemical elements in a man's body. Upon the presence or absence of phosphorus in his system depends the existence of his soul. Such an answer as this to the question "Whence am I?" need only to be stated to be rejected, at least by all Christians. It is an answer I admit sufficient for men who believe that the universe is God, but not for men

who believe that the universe is controlled by one great immaterial master-mind. To us who do so believe, such an answer is the answer of a fool.

But this same question, when propounded to our Divine Teacher, receives a complete and sufficient reply. "Whence art thou?" Thou art a distinct creation of the Almighty's hand. Thou art as thy father Adam is declared to be, "the Son of God." A spark of divinity burns within you. Your body, it is true, is of the dust, and shall return to the dust from whence it was taken. Your animal life also—the life which you have in common with the other creatures of this earth—must also expire. But your Spirit, the Inspiration of Deity which abides in you, the faculty of discerning between good and evil in their own nature, which is your awful prerogative, this proves your high descent, and declares your Divine ancestry. Sin and sorrow and self-contempt may rankle in your breast; but you know why they are there. They are no part of your original nature, they do not belong to you by any law of your being: they spring from the injury inflicted upon, from the poison imbibed by, your first father. Despite them you are from God and, fallen as you are, you rightly address Him as "Our Father."

3. To the third great question, "For what purpose am I here in this world?" Nature gives no more satisfactory response than she did to less practical enquiries. The struggle for existence which is evident in every department of mundane life: the way in which one class of trees in a forest will gradually oust another: the manner in which a strong weed will overgrow all surrounding vegetation: the incessant warfare which one order of fishes or of birds will carry on against another: the encroachments of land upon sea, and of sea upon land; all these things point to but one conclusion, namely, that it is the duty of man to do the best he can for himself, to hold his own as far as possible, and to remember that in a world where force prevails, weakness is the greatest crime. I say that Nature, when you consult Nature alone as to what is your business in life, teaches you that self-preservation is not only her first but her only law. For example, when driven by the hunter the tigress will desert her cubs, and under the pressure of famine human mothers have been known to devour their offspring. Self, as the first of all considerations: self, as the centre to which all things must be made if possible to converge: self, as the one paramount thought and object—this, if you consult external nature alone, is the purpose for which you are here.

How different from this is the object of human existence as presented to us by Jesus the Light of the World! He has taught us that to live for self is spiritual suicide. To live for *God*; to act ever, as Jesus acted, upon the principle, "Not my will but Thine be done;" to live for *good*, for the good of others in preference to our own; to live for the *formation of a character*, which shall resemble the wise, the just, the beneficent, the loving character of the Almighty Himself—this is a Christian's idea of the intention of this life. And what a contrast does this present to all heathen systems of morality. Epicureanism, which in its later development was the philosophy of self-indulgence, hides its head in shame: and Stoicism, which was the philosophy of despair, vanishes away when compared with the Christian scheme of life. To become like God in His goodness, in His holiness, and in His supreme and unbroken happiness; could man have had presented to him a nobler object of life than this, a more complete and satisfactory answer to his question—for what purpose am I here?

4. But once more. As man interrogates Nature in vain when he asks her what he is, whence he is, and for what he is; so when he asks the yet more-anxious question, Whither am I going? he receives a reply which chills him with horror and dismay. Nature tells man that the grave is the end of all things for him; that he must fall as the tree falls and be mingled with the soil; that life, thought, and love must disappear in rottenness and corruption: that he will never look again upon the face of wife or child, or behold the glorious canopy of heaven, but be reduced to a cold, motionless, senseless clod of earth. Nature tells him that there is the same end for the good and for the bad, for the oppressor and the oppressed, for Paul and for Nero, for Jesus and for Pilate. Nature tell him that Death to which he has the most intense repugnance, that Death which is to him the worst of ills, and the most appalling of catastrophes, *must come*; but she tells him nothing more, and leaves him full of anxiety and dread, of misery and terror. This has been so in all ages and among all nations. "When the Missionaries of the Cross preached before King Edwin, an old chief rose and said: 'O King, as we sit by night round the fire in the hall, and make good cheer, it often happens that a little bird flies for a moment into the light and heat; it *comes* out of the cold and darkness, and it *goes* out into the cold and darkness: but none know whence it comes, and none can tell whither it goes. And so is our own life. We come, and our wise men cannot tell us whence; we go, and they cannot tell us whither. Therefore if there be any who can give us certainty about a future state, in God's name let us hear them.'"

And this, my brethren, Jesus the Light of the World does, and He alone. He has brought life and immortality to light. He has taught us that when we commit our dear one's body to the ground, we do not leave *him* there, but that he himself, his true self, *i.e.*, his mind and spirit, is in the paradise of God, where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest. Christ has taught us that death is but a dark passage from one life to another, and that that after-life shall know no ending. Beyond this also he has assured us of what we should never have guessed from Nature, namely, of a Judgment to come. And how necessary as a support to their belief in the justice of

God this revelation is to the poor, persecuted, and down-trodden ones of this earth, it is easy to imagine. It has been truly said that "without a belief in God the avenger of all such as call upon Him, and a future life in which the wicked should cease from troubling and be troubled himself in turn, Man, the most down-trodden of all creatures, would wrap his mantle about his face, creep like a wounded hare into a corner, and sob to death."

But while I thus have endeavoured to impress upon you that Nature is unable to explain man and his life, I would guard myself against being supposed to depreciate the study of the marvellous works of God. If instead of asking Nature to explain God and the mystery of their own existence men would ask God to explain nature to them, and themselves *to* themselves, they would find in every leaf and insect, rock and star, in every passion and emotion of the human heart, some mark of Divine wisdom and goodness. But when this process is reversed, and men pretend to judge of God and themselves from the minutely-small portion of the universe submitted to their notice, they must necessarily draw, as men have ever drawn, erroneous or incomplete conclusions. It is true indeed in a sense to say that God reveals Himself in His works, but the revelation thereby made is but partial; the revelation which He made of Himself, when the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity Who was born of the Virgin Mary, that alone was complete and sufficient for the guidance of man.

Bear, therefore, ever in mind how much you owe to the Advent of Christ. If that Sun of Righteousness had not risen we should have gone on still in intellectual, moral, and spiritual darkness. Even to this very day men would have deemed themselves simply material atoms in the universe, of unknown origin, obliged to selfishness for three-score years and ten, and then entering upon annihilation. But you, you know that you are immortal souls, created by the Almighty, bound to live according to His laws, and destined to everlasting blessedness. Live, then, now as citizens of the far-off heavenly land: live as children of light; that so you may at last receive the crown of light and life from Jesus, the Light of the World.

The Rev. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph, of Ringmore Rectory, Kingsbridge, asks to receive the names of those who are ready to support a movement for the arrangement of a meeting of Churchmen to be held at Leicester during the Congress week to declare publicly how they will deal with the Burials Bill.

The next Diocesan Conference of St. Albans is to be held on the 14th and 15th of October. The chief subjects for discussion are—(1) "How to Promote a better Observance of the Ordinances of Religion among all classes of people;" (2) "The Law and existing practice as to the sale, resignation, and exchange of Ecclesiastical Benefices;" (3) "Popular Recreations—how may they be improved and encouraged?"

HOLINESS ON THE BELLS OF THE HORSES.

By the Rev. H. C. Mitchinson, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Rotherhithe: Late Scholar of Clare College, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached at Christ Church, Rotherhithe, on Wednesday, August 18th, 1880.

"In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, holiness unto the Lord; and the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar. Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness unto the Lord of hosts: and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and seethe therein: and in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts."—Zech. xiv. 20—21.

THE period to which this refers is still future. It is plainly foretold in verse 11 that the Jews shall be restored to their own land. "And men shall dwell in it" *i.e.*, in the land of Judea or city of Jerusalem "and there shall be no more utter destruction; but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited." Also that those who have opposed this settlement shall be destroyed. "And this shall be the plague wherewith the Lord shall smite all the people who have fought against Jerusalem; their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth." Both Jews and Gentiles shall embrace the faith of Christ (9). "The Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall there be one Lord, and His name one." And this is also represented by Gentiles going up to Jerusalem, which is to be the centre or capital of the Christianized world, to keep the Feast of Tabernacles, *i.e.*, they shall recognise and worship Jesus as God tabernacling in the flesh—God Incarnate. The Jews at last acknowledging, and the Gentile or heathen nations for the first time hearing, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself. "And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations that came up against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles." Those who refuse to do so are to be visited with heavy plagues—"It shall be that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain." Piety is to be almost universal, extending generally to all persons and acts. "All shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest." During the Milleninum, and after the Coming of Christ, for His feet will have stood again on the Mount of Olives, whence He ascended, the text describes what will be the state of things—"In that day there shall be upon the bells of the horses, holiness unto the Lord; and the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar. Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness unto the Lord of hosts; and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and seethe therein: and in that day there shall be no more the

Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts." But the piety which shall then be general among the inhabitants of the world, should mark those who are God's people now. And we may gather from our text what real piety is, and use the text as a standard, to which we should aim to rise, if we would assure our hearts before God.

(1.) In that day shall there be on the bells of the horses, "holiness unto the Lord." This was the inscription on the mitre of the High Priest, but it is not to be confined to him or his mitre. It is to be on the bells of the horses. In other words, religion is not a thing to be restricted to the Church: but should influence us in the World. Common occupations, such as are carried on by means of horses, are to be performed with an eye to God, as well as our more definitely religious acts of devotion. We are to serve God indirectly in our callings as well as directly in our ordinances; secular things are to be conducted on the same holy principles of faith and obedience as our sacred services. The idea contained in the expression "Holiness to the Lord on the bells of the horses," is expressed in such plain sentences as these: "Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God." "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God." And thus the trivial round, the common task, the ordinary occupation furnishes the sphere for regarding God's word, manifesting the spirit, disposition, and temper he requires, practising the self-denial, honesty, fairness, yielding, kindness, consideration he demands: and amid the world's clanking wheels of business or pleasure, we are to mingle with our common acts and doings, submission to His will, a tracing of his kind providential interposition, sweet meditation on his mercy and grace to us in Christ Jesus, and thus "Holiness to the Lord upon the bells of the horses" shall be fostering that Holiness without which no man shall see the Lord, or the Holiness of Heaven, where glorified Saints as well as unfallen Angels, do His will, and are pleased with His appointment; trace admiringly all the way by which He has led them, and how by Grace they are saved, and sing "Salvation to our God, who sitteth on the Throne and to the Lamb."

Or, taking the expression "Bells of the horses," for harness, trappings, adornments and equipments of horses generally, we may observe—Horses are used in State processions; and when a Sovereign, like George III. is drawn by noble steeds, with rich harness, through thronging crowds, with a heart which bows before the King of Kings, and trusts in the Prince of Peace to give him an immortal crown, when He shall come in the Chariots of Heaven; then Holiness to the Lord is on the bells of royal horses. And when Sir Thomas Abney retired for family prayer, during the Lord Mayor's feast, after the Lord Mayor's procession and Lord Mayor's show, on that stately pomp and pageant there was "Holiness to the Lord." And when the Lord Mayors of more modern times ride in procession, realizing as we trust some of them do, their responsiblity, and purposing schemes of benevolence for sufferers by famine, or fire, or accident, and it is carried out on scriptural principles, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me," a nobler crest, though invisible to man, shines out to the eyes of Heaven, than the ordinary one worked on the harness or painted on the coach, and it is "Holiness to the Lord."

Again. Horses are used for recreation, and bells tinkle from their harness, as they draw the diligence of the Continent or the tram-car at home; and we may say there is "On the bells of the horses Holiness unto the Lord." When we use recreation of any kind, at home or abroad, such and so as to fit us to do the duties of life better, such and so that it does not mar or impair our spiritual life.

Again. Horses are used in journeying, and there is "Holiness to the Lord upon the bells of the horses," when we seek or seize an opportunity of speaking a word in season to a fellow-traveller, and act in a Christian manner to porters, and guards, and conductors, and officials, instead of assuming an imperious, bullying, scolding tone for things which occur in God's Providence to try our patience, and over which it may be, those we find fault with, have no control whatever, then there is Holiness to the Lord in common travelling.

Horses are used in merchandize, and when strings of packhorses were used for this purpose, they were dressed out with bells, and there is "Holiness to the Lord" when the business of money-making is conducted on Christian principles, and with a due regard for obtaining or preserving an interest in the unsearchable riches of Christ. Or if it be the bell of the shop rather than the bells of horses, Holiness ought to be on that bell. Oh! if ever people get short weight, or bad articles that will not wash or wear, though it is asserted that they will, or incivility and rudeness, let it not be at a Christian's shop; whose Book of guidance contains such directions and statements as these, a "false weight is an abomination unto the Lord." "It is naught, it is naught, saith the buyer, and he goeth away and boasteth." Let trade be conducted on principles of piety, and then on the shop-bell there is "Holiness to the Lord." Again. As there should be Holiness to the Lord on the bells of the horses, there should be also on the bells of the houses. When the bell is rung in parlour, or dining-room, or drawing-room, it should be the echo of harmony and unison prevailing there, or "Holiness to the Lord" is not; for where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work, and God is the author of peace and not of confusion. And when the bell rings in the kitchen or servants' hall, it should not sound as an alarm to servants, who perform their duties with eye-service, making them start, because they are talking or doing as they ought not, or not doing what they ought, and would if master or mistress was there. Neither should the bell be so rung as if by an imperious, over-

bearing, impatient, or passionate hand, or there is not "Holiness to the Lord," for there is a forgetfulness of the precept "Render unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven."

And when the the Visitors' bell sounds, there is not "Holiness to the Lord on the bell" if, as the name is announced or card handed in, there is an ill-suppressed expression of annoyance on the countenance, and a muttered "What a nuisance!" on the lip, and then the next moment, when the guests appear, the blandest smile on the face and hearty words of welcome on the tongue. For this is to act deceit, forbidden by a Holy God, to whom lying lips or acts are an abomination. And on the Visitors' bell we must add there is not "Holiness to the Lord," if the visit issue in mere slander, scandal or trifling idle talk, and there is no attempt to obey the exhortation "Let your conversation be always with grace, seasoned with salt," unless, at least, if religion be not present in the conversation as a subject, it is not absent, as an influence.

Once more. "The bells on the horses" give notice of their approach. And wherever a Christian comes, holiness to the Lord should attend him. There ought to be a savour in his conversation, manner, tone and spirit, as one who is "the Garden of the Lord, on whom the Spirit blows and the spices flow out." It should be with us as with one of whom it was said in answer to the question: "What sort of a person was he?" He is this sort of person, that when he has called on you, you know he has been there. With some this is eminently so; with all, it ought to be, evidently so.

(2.) "And the pots in the Lord's House shall be like the bowls before the altar." Lesser things in the service of God should be attended to, as well as more important: earthern pots, as well as golden bowls, held sacred. The Christian will not merely attend God's House on Sunday, but, if possible, also on a Week-day. He will not merely make a point of conscience of coming generally, but regularly, frequently, in time, and will be reverent in outward demeanour, as well as inwardly devotional. He will worship God in body as well as in spirit. He will not despise the poor preacher, who has the treasure of the Gospel in a very earthen vessel, and whose speech and whose preaching is not with enticing words of man's wisdom, and only think the golden bowl, the eloquent preacher, who comes with excellency of speech or of wisdom, worthy of his attention. But as the pot in the Temple as well as the bowl was connected with offering the typical sacrifice, he will consider the pots as bowls, the less attractive as well as the more attractive preacher worthy his regard, if he tell of Christ's sacrifice, and its accompanying blessings, privileges, hopes, and duties.

(3.) "Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness to the Lord of Hosts." Piety in one's own house, as well as in the House of God. Connecting the word pot with the idea of cooking, it means that Christians should eat and drink to the glory of God; for strength and not for drunkenness, that God's gifts should not be abused by excess: that where there is a healthy state of soul, that will not be made the food or fuel of lust which should be oil to the wheels of obedience; and it will be felt that "better is a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox and hatred therewith;" and grumbling and fault-finding will be checked.

If we connect pots with cleaning, it may remind servants that, if Christians, they will do the most menial act as unto the Lord; show their conversion, as the little domestic once said, by sweeping under the mats, live contented with their lot in imitation of Him Who took upon Him the form of a servant, do everything thoroughly, orderly, and planningly in their work, remembering how sytematically God proceeded in the Creation of the World, as described (Gen. 1), proving the truth of the Apostle's statement, God is a God of order; how Jesus set an example of orderliness and arrangement, when He wrought the miracle of the loaves; for He commanded them to make all sit down by companies on the green grass, and they sat in ranks or garden plots, and that neatness was not disregarded by the Saviour on the morning of the Resurrection, when He wrapped together the napkin, that was about His head, in a place by itself. Thus every pot should be "Holiness to the Lord."

(4.) And all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, *i.e.*, of the pots and seethe therein. That is, common as well as sacred vessels shall be used for boiling the sacrifice. Where there is real Holiness people are not nice and particular about ceremonial Holiness. The true worshipper seeks to worship in spirit; this is the main thing; he makes it of second importance whether it be in this place or that, "Neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem." His worship is not limited or restricted to church or consecrated building. He claims his Christian liberty. "I will that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting."

> Jesus, where'er Thy people meet
> There they behold Thy mercy seat,
> Where'er they seek Thee Thou art found
> And every place is hallowed ground.

One place is as acceptable as another. Just as one vessel might boil the sacrifice as well as another — the pot as well as the golden bowl; the great point being that the sacrifice is properly prepared—the offering not cold, but fervent—warmed with no strange fire. The spirit of worship is more with a child of God than the manner and way—if the substance is religiously preserved, the circumstance is secondary—he can be edified by a pious layman's prayer, address, or writings, as by a minister's; by a written or extempore sermon. At the same time he does not disparage sacred persons, places, days, and things—the bowls before the altar—because he can make ordinary persons, places, days, and things—every pot in Jerusalem and Judah —conducive and helpful to his spiritual growth.

(5.) "And in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the House of the Lord of Hosts." The word "Canaanite" means merchant or trader. Neither ought there to be now. "Take these things hence—make not my Father's house a house of merchandize." Brethren, are there none who "profess and call themselves Christians," behaving every Sunday as badly as those Jews, whom our Lord thus rebuked: bringing into the House of God their trade, money, business, account books, bargains, contracts, household matters, worldly affairs, to which they ought to say at the porch of the Church, as Abraham said to his young men at the foot of the Mount, "Stay ye here, while I go and worship God yonder." My brethren, these things ought not so to be. No Canaanite in the House of the Lord. He who brings his body to God's house one day in the week, and allows his mind to wander amid the cares, engagements, arrangements of the other six, is an abomination unto the Lord.

You should carry your religion into ordinary affairs, for there should be on the bells of the horses, "Holiness unto the Lord," and "every pot should be Holiness to the Lord of Hosts." But you should not carry your ordinary affairs into your religious worship, except for the sake of guidance and blessing, and that you may go forth to conduct them in a right manner and with a proper spirit. "For there should not be the Canaanite in the house of the Lord."

SELF-DECEPTION.

By the Rev. HENRY G. HIRD, B.A.,
Curate-in-Charge of the Mission Church of the Good Shepherd, Thornhill Edge, Dewsbury.

Sermon Preached in the Church of the Good Shepherd, Thornhill Edge, Aug. 22nd, 1880.

"Let no man deceive himself."—1 Cor. iii. 18.

ALL are agreed that we have little knowledge of the things around us. The wisest know not much of the works of God. But there is still something more of which men are ignorant, viz., themselves. Some who know the most of the world know the least of themselves. They are ignorant of their real wants, passions, and propensities. The saying which was common among the heathen, "Know thyself," is one upon which Christians might act with profit to their souls. Of all knowledge (except a knowledge of God) this is the most useful. And it is knowledge within the reach of all. It is a great evil when men deceive themselves, thinking themselves to be different from what they really are. To be deceived by a neighbour is bad enough, to be deceived by one's self is far worse. One would almost think that none would be guilty of thus acting towards themselves. But facts show how common it is for men to deceive themselves. It is not a few who thus act, but the multitudes. Men go through life self-deceived and they know it not. Those in this state are shut out from the realities of life. They are like blind men walking amidst the most beautiful scenery, they know nothing of it. But there is one point of difference in the comparison. The blind are so from no fault of their own, but the self-deceived suffer an evil laid upon themselves by their own acts. They do not make any efforts to acquire knowledge of themselves and therefore they remain ignorant. For self-knowledge, like all other knowledge, can only be gained by effort.

There are three causes of self-deception of which I wish to speak now, and the first is ignorance of the state of the heart. Its natural state is such that one can easily see that no one has a particular desire to find it out. But such knowledge is necessary for a right life. The more common way of acting is, however, to pass by examining the heart and to think that it is swept of all evil. And such thoughts lead to improper conduct. This opinion is flatly denied by the teaching of Holy Scripture. The prophet Jeremiah says, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?"* Christ says, "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies. These are the things which defile a man."† With this agrees the teaching of our own Church as set forth in her Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies. The ninth Article says, "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk); but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world it deserveth God's wrath and damnation." She acknowledges in the general confession that "We have erred, and strayed from God's ways like lost sheep." The Catechism teaches us that we are "by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath." The Homilies set forth in the time of King Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth are sanctioned by the 35th Article, and in them we read "We have heard how that, of ourselves and by ourselves, we are not able either to think a good thought, or work a good deed: so that we find in ourselves no hope of salvation, but rather whatsoever maketh unto our destruction."‡ Again. "Man of his own nature is fleshly and carnal, corrupt and naught, sinful and disobedient to God, without any spark of goodness in him, without any virtuous or godly motion, only given to evil thoughts and wicked deeds."§ So then the Bible and our own Church clearly teach us that man's nature is corrupt. The fruits of the life even from childhood confirm this teaching. It is also seen from the state in which men live in this world. God would not allow innocent and pure creatures

* Jer. xvii. 9. † St. Matt. xv. 19-20.
‡ Book I. Homily II. Part 2, p. 19.
§ Book II. Homily XVI. Part 1, p. 490.

to be subject to the pains, anxieties, and toils that beset human life from the cradle to the grave. That man is corrupt before God is the teaching both of revelation and nature.

What a mistaken idea it is therefore to think that the heart is pure. Ignorance of its true condition must lead to self-deception. Ignorance of bodily disease is sad and often produces serious results. But ignorance of moral evil is much more sad and produces more serious results. Men's hearts are stained with guilt and they know it not. They look up to heaven like the Pharisee of old, and thank God that they are not as other men are. But they are like unto whited sepulchres, beautiful outward and foul inward. These are the self-deceived who know not themselves and the effects of sin upon their characters. They are pure in their own eyes, but they are corrupt before God.

Another cause of self-deception is ignorance of the true relationship existing between God and man. Judging from the conduct of many, you might conclude that God was never in their thoughts, and there are others who seem to think that their acts are not observed by Him. There is, however, a closer relationship existing between God and man, than there is between any human beings towards each other. He is the Father of all living and by Him life is prolonged and protected. We are God's children and therefore we may call Him "Our Father." But this relationship is not realized by the multitudes. Few really feel that God is their Father. The multitudes have certain notions about God's power and mercy, but their ideas are are far from what they ought to be. And as long as they have these imperfect views their lives cannot come up to the Gospel standard. There is nothing tends to promote self-deception more than the strange views which men have of God's mercy. They think that to be merciful means never to punish the wrong-doer. Thus they rob God of His majesty and make the sinner as worthy as the saint. This gives them a sort of satisfaction with themselves that is not wise. And they grope about in the dark, thinking that they are walking in the light. But how different would be their experience if they really knew God and the relationship existing between Him and them. Then they would from their hearts be able to call Him their Father, and trust in Him. Then they would not be self-deceived, but they would know Him and His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

The third cause of self-deception is, ignorance of life and its duties. How few really feel the dignity of life, and the responsibilities of its duties? With the multitude life is looked upon as having been given simply for gratifying carnal lusts, and finding as much pleasure as the world can give. It is astonishing what low ideas of life prevail among the people. The gods of luxury and pleasure are served most earnestly. And man, made in the image of God, is degraded almost to the level of the brutes that perish. Men want a higher ideal of what life should be. And until they get it they must deceive themselves. It is a sad thing to mistake the purpose of life. And yet this is what multitudes are doing. It is only few who feel the truth set forth by St. Paul in this chapter, "For we are labourers together with God." There would be no more mis-spent lives if men felt that they were thus called to such a high office as being "labourers together with God." That is the only true way in which to fulfil life's duties. And those who do not act in this spirit are self-deceivers.

It must be evident that self-deception is no desirable state in which to live. And yet there is no state into which men are so liable to fall as this. It besets all classes of men. Priest, prophet, and people may all deceive themselves and wake up in eternity different beings from what they regarded themselves. Seeing there is such danger of being self-deceived, there should be an earnest desire to escape the danger. And that this may be done there must be great watchfulness. We should watch ourselves as much as we would watch our houses at night if we were told that thieves were near. We must be jealous of self, knowing that the heart is "deceitful above all things." Trust not thyself, is a rule which we should do well to act upon. And there should be earnest prayer to God that He would keep us from falling into the pit of self-deception. For unless God stretches out His Almighty hand and saves us we shall fall into it and not be able to rise again. By the help of the Holy Spirit we may know ourselves, our relationship to God, and the duties of life. Knowing these things we may act accordingly and thus be saved from a great evil. It is the plain duty of every one to acquire knowledge of himself and his duty towards God. Ignorance of these things would be wilful with us and therefore without excuse. Happy is the man who knows the will of God and does it. He is fulfilling the command of St. Paul, "Let no man deceive himself."

The committee appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury to examine into the question of the Episcopal Supervision of the English Chaplaincies in Northern and Central Europe is composed as follows:—The Bishops of London (chairman), Winchester, and Rochester; the prolocutor, Lord Alwyn Compton, Dean of Worcester; Bishop Claughton, Archdeacon of London; Rev. Sir. J. E. Phillips, Bart.; Rev. L. Nevile, Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge; Canon Wilkinson, vicar of St. Peter's, Pimlico; Canon Erskine Clarke, vicar of Battersea. The first meeting of the committee will take place in November.

The annual reports of the Diocesan Inspectors for Essex, which have just been presented to the Bishop of St. Albans, show that in the past year 430 schools were inspected in 333 parishes. The number of the scholars on the books was 52,195. In the Sunday-schools there were 2,610 teachers and 30,050 scholars. All these figures show an increase upon last year. The night schools examined, however, are only 43, with 895 scholars, as against 63, with 1,359 scholars in 1879.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1880.

IN reply to "C. P. R.'s" letter in our present issue, we beg to express our conviction that not one of the writers or readers of this Journal hold the opinion that Circumcision is essentially necessary to salvation. No one surely who believes in the truth of Scripture and that Chrislianity is an affair of the spirit, would for a moment suppose that any mere outward and material ordinance was a "religious *necessity*." All that we have ventured to state is that Circumcision, which was given as a token of the "Everlasting Covenant" of Faith in God, is a valuable means of grace, which, bearing in mind its adoption by Christ in His own person, aud in the absence of any express command from God, we think has been somewhat lightly set aside by the Gentile Church. No doubt, according to the accepted reading of Acts xv., the Holy Ghost, although He would not impose Circumcision, but more especially the yoke of the Mosaic Ceremonial Law on the converts at Antioch, expressly recognised the Grace of which it is the token, "purifying their hearts by faith." Probably the Gentile Christians at Antioch sought relief more from the Law of Moses than from Circumcision; for at the beginning of the very next chapter in the Acts we read of St. Paul himself Circumcising the Gentile Timothy. We should very much like to see our respected correspondent "C. R. P.," than whom no one is more able by his learning as well as his logic, reconcile the teaching of Acts xv. with that of Genesis xvii., touching Circumcision. "The idea of the whole (Gentile) Church since the Apostle's days having been mistaken" as to the value of this God-given means of Grace will perhaps not appear so "grotesque" to our correspondent when he bears in mind the enormous influence of prejudice and feeling in all matters of religion, and when he considers the vast number of races and peoples that still practice Circumcision. Even as a sanitary measure we believe there exists in England a strong religious prejudice against it. For centuries there has undoubtedly existed among us in common with other European nations, a religious and political antipithy to Jews and Mahometans. If it were only to dispel such hatred prejudice, we are of opinion that our Clergy and Theologians would do good service in calmly examining and discussing the value and moral benefits of Circumcision as a religious rite. If it prevents the sin of Onanism, as we have reliable evidence that it does, which is confirmed by "G. T.", it is surely deserving of a careful enquiry. A former correspondent doubted the extent to which the sins of impurity in boyhood are carried. The Masters of our Public Boarding Schools and their Medical Attendants could enlighten him. The experienced master of one of our large Public Schools thanks us for ventilating this subject, and writes, "I am sure that no school which is not quite confident of its complete mastery of the individual in consequence of complete structure and proper machinery, *dares* probe this deadly wound."

THE ATONEMENT.—No. II.

Some time since we laid before our readers a few thoughts on the Atonement, from the point of view of the co-extensiveness of its effects with those of the Fall —viz., thus, that ignorance concerning it does not deprive it of some of its most blessed influences. Take for example the case of the heathen; though they know nothing of the revelation of God's will in the Bible until they are told of it, and have therefore never heard of the Fall of Adam, we never have any hesitation in stating that they are involved in its melancholy consequences. If, then, ignorance concerning the Fall does not exempt the heathen from its ill effects; why should ignorance concerning the Redemption deprive them of its good effects? This truth, simple as it is, seems very insufficiently realized until another step is taken. When a missionary lands in a heathen country, as soon as he can make himself understood, he begins to preach the Gospel to the inhabitants, and tells them of the fall of man in Adam, and of his redemption by Christ. How "by the offence of One judgment came on all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men to justification of life." But this preaching must go on the assumption that those who hear it for the first time are both fallen and redeemed: fallen in Adam, and redeemed in Christ. And the preacher who tells the heathen that Christ died for them must, if he reflects, be aware that he is informing them of a fact which does not merely begin then to be true, but of a fact which always was true, though previously unknown to them. And so the first work of a Christian missionary to the heathen goes on the assumption of the universality of the effects of the Atonement towards the human race. But enough upon this head. We now proceed briefly to notice some popular explanations of the nature of the Atonement. And here it may be said, at the outset, that some divines, at least in the past, have been rather too fond of explaining the Atonement. They have fallen into the error of using what logicians call an "analogy of illustration" for an "analogy of proof." Take a favourite instance. Sin is often compared to debt. People are or were often told from the pulpit, you are

sinners, you are debtors to God; if you could keep free of debt for the future, even that would not wipe out the obligations of the past. Your only hope is Christ; He has paid all the debt, and if you accept His work you are free: God will not ask to be paid twice. You shall have a clear receipt signed with your Saviour's name. Now while there may be some, perhaps even a great element of truth in this style of teaching, it should be borne distinctly in mind that at best the above analogy is one of illustration, not of proof. Debt is a very insufficient type of sin; for example, when people are told that keeping out of debt for the future will not wipe out the obligations of the past, they may say, true, but there are instances of persons who, after a course of extravagance, have not only ceased to incur fresh obligations, but by carefulness have accumulated sufficient funds to meet all past defalcations. But this is an application of the illustration that would not find favour with those who are so fond of employing it. Some sins are more of the nature of a monetary debt than others, and therefore are more capable of reparation. Thus offences against the Eighth Commandment may be satisfied for by the offender to his neighbour, while those against the Sixth and Seventh can not. One can restore stolen property, but he cannot restore violated purity or extinguished life. In these latter cases the analogy of debt falls far short of being a true description of the nature of sin—

"Put out the light!
If I quench thee, thou flaming minister,
I can again thy former light restore.
Should I repent me:—but once put out thy light,
Thou cunning'st pattern of excelling nature,
I know not where is that Promethean heat
That can thy light relume. When I have pluck'd thy rose
I cannot give it vital growth again,
It needs must wither."

There is another fault about this illustration, viz., that if accepted as sufficient it tends to completely ignore the nature of sin as a disease. If sin is merely a debt, or rather if this view of it is mainly insisted and dwelt upon, its other aspect as a disease is overlooked; an aspect of which we are reminded in the striking words "Heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee." The work of the Lord Jesus was to save His people from their sins, not only from their guilt, but from their power. All this shows us how imperfect is the analogy of debt. I can of my own free will pay a debt for a friend. I can free him from some of the consequences of his folly and extravagance, or it may be of his dishonesty; but the creditor whom I satisfy does not really regard me as in any sense morally guilty of my friend's acts, there is no transfer to me in his eyes of anything but a legal monetary responsibility, voluntarily undertaken, which, so far from being discreditable to me, is praiseworthy. And thus again the analogy of debt breaks down in the hands of those who use it, for they are, it is to be feared, too fond of including in their theory of the Atonement an actual personal transfer and application of our moral guilt to Christ. This is holy ground, and it becomes us to tread it reverently and carefully. The subject, it seems to us, is well treated in Mrs. Alexander's hymn—

"We may not know, we cannot tell
What pains He had to bear,
But we believe it was for us
He hung and suffered there.

He died that we might be forgiven,
He died to make us good:
That we might go at last to heaven,
Saved by His precious blood."

The substance of the foregoing observations is this. Let preachers be careful not to mistake analogies of illustration for analogies of proof upon this and other difficult points of doctrine; and with regard to this point in particular, let them bear in mind that the aspect of sin as a disease is, to say the least of it, quite as necessary to be borne in mind as its other aspect as a debt.

"Some," says Bishop Butler, "have endeavoured to explain the efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us beyond what the Scripture has authorized; others, probably because they could not explain it, have been for taking it away and confining His office as Redeemer of the world to His instruction, example, and government of the Church. Whereas the doctrine of the Gospel appears to be, not only that He taught the efficacy of repentance, but rendered it of the efficacy which it is by what He did and suffered for us: that He obtained for us the benefit of having our repentance accepted unto eternal life; not only that He revealed to sinners that they were in a capacity of salvation, and how they might obtain it; but moreover that He put them into this capacity of salvation by what He did and suffered for them; put us into a capacity of escaping future punishment and obtaining future happiness. And it is our wisdom thankfully to accept the benefit by performing the conditions upon which it is offered, on our part, without disputing how it was procured on His."

CORRESPONDENCE.

CIRCUMCISION.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—It seems to have been forgotten, by the writers on this subject in your paper, that the question of the religious necessity of Circumcision has been decided, once for all, in the negative, not by St. Paul alone, but by the voice of the Holy Ghost, if we are to believe the language of the letter addressed by the first Council of Jerusalem to the Church of Antioch, recorded in the 15th chapter of the Book of the Acts. It is, indeed, a grotesque idea that ever since the Apostles' days the whole Church should have been mistaken on such a point.

The sanitary advantages of Circumcision, and its consequent moral usefulness, I should like to see carefully examined and discussed by experts. It is, however, a subject which can hardly be treated in the pages of a journal intended for general reading.

August 30, 1880. C. P. R.

Sir,—I was rather surprised at seeing an extract from my letter on the subject of Circumcision in print, as I had no particular desire to have it printed; it was simply written off *currente calamo*, as the first thought that came into my head on the subject. When I wrote I had not read either your article or "R. G.'s" letter. I am so busy just at this moment that I have no time to give for its proper consideration; but "R. G." could be very easily answered. He does not grasp at all the main question, viz., that Circumcision appears, medically speaking, to be, to a very considerable extent, a prevention of the dreadful sin of "Onanism," alas! so prevalent amongst boys. The punishment of Onan probably had preserved the Jews very much from this sin, and it did not come at all

within the range of St. Paul's argument to notice it; he was, as I said before, only concerned with Circumcision as a religious rite, which he insisted was no longer necessary even for Jews, much less for Gentile converts; and marriage, which he recommends, as "G. R." states, "as conducing to purity," he recommends as a remedy against fornication—illicit intercourse with women, with which of course Circumcision, as "G. R." seems to suppose, had nothing whatever to do—and not as a remedy against the other perhaps still more terrible sin, which ends in grievous debility of mind and body, and, if persisted in, madness.

August 30, 1880. G. T.

—:o:—

THE LORD'S DAY.

SIR,—Your last number contains a letter from Mr. Galbraith advocating the views of Sabbath Observance which have been held by good and learned men, but which are not therefore necessarily correct. In my essay on "The Sabbath Made for Man," which has been advertised in your columns, and a copy of which has, I presume, been sent to you, these views are met by an elaborate argument dealing, as I venture to think, fully and fairly with all that has been advanced on that side. It is impossible to give all the points of of that argument within the compass of a short letter, but I should like just to mention—

First, that we who hold the Fourth Commandment to be still in force, do not thereby maintain, any more than our opponents, that any portion of *the law of Moses* is binding upon Christians. What we maintain is that the Fourth Commandment is no more a part of the Mosaic Law than are the rest of the Ten Commandments.

Secondly, the Fourth Commandment is as literally obeyed by observing the *First* day of the week as by observing the *Seventh*. No day of the week is named in it. Christians, as truly as Jews, receive its words, "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all that thou hast to do, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The seventh day *after six*, and not the seventh day *of the week*, is invariably the injunction in the Old Testament.

Teignmouth. G. A. JACOB, D.D.

—:o:—

TESTIMONIAL TO THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

SIR,—In view of the determination shown by the Legislature to ignore the recommendations of Convocation in legislation affecting the National Church and its Burial grounds, pointing to the incorporation in the governing class of an element alien to the Church, and to the dominance of a secularist spirit as the ruling principle and tendency of the day, it is refreshing to be able to discern in the response made to the proposed Testimonial to the good bishop of Lincoln, an encouraging sign in the opposite direction.

When it was determined to make this memorial the basis and starting-point of a larger effort in the interests of the Church, the depth of the sentiment which had been elicited towards the Bishop by the thoroughness of his convictions and the warmth of their expression in the House of Lords, especially at the close of his speech, on the Second Reading of the Burial's Bill, has been again shewn by the energy with which this later proposal was taken up on all sides. While the motto of the good Bishop himself seems to be that quoted below, I think we may say with him *Non nobis Domine*, should his dignified attitude inspire the Church with something of the same spirit, and the strength of the Head of the Church be made known in the hour of that Church's weakness.

Already has the call for a staff of workers been met by offers of help from clergymen representing eight Dioceses. From a circular issued on St. Bartholomew's Day, the public will learn that the Rev. C. W. Markham, Rector of Saxby All Saints, Burton-on-Humber, has offered his services as treasurer of the proposed fund, to which I called the attention of your readers in last week's issue. The Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham, in accepting this offer, expresses his pleasure at so soon meeting with a clergyman beneficed in the Dioccse, willing to take upon himself the responsibility of canvassing for support, one whose name will give confidence to intending contributors. Some unaccountable mishap prevented the appearance of Mr. Markham's appeal in the *Guardian* of last week, which when writing to you I had anticipated would forestal the appearance of my letter. Hence my reference to that paper, and my accidental omission to furnish Mr. Markham's name, which I discovered too late to rectify last week, may have misled those who found in the publication referred to an appeal on behalf of a totally different object, especially as its advocate sent a copy of the same letter for insertion in the same issue of your organ as that in which you were good enough to allow mine to appear. Lest the two appeals should be understood to have come from the same quarter, it is necessary to mention that the promoters of the Bishopric Fund were not aware of the intention to advocate the claims of the Theological School at Lincoln in connexion with the proposed memorial to the Bishop of Lincoln, and that the delay which prevented the appearance of Mr. Markham's appeal simultaneously with that of the Bishop of Nottingham's letter, a copy of which you kindly inserted, was one which they could not have foreseen. I enclose Circular referred to above, which prehaps you may be able to insert, and thus our scheme will at length be fairly launched.

G. E. WATKINS.

Stanford-le-hope, August 30th, 1880.

P.S.—I trust the coincidence of a twofold appeal wil tend *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*, and that St. Paul's exhortation to the Galatians (ch. iv. 18) will be borne in mind by those to whom the joint appeal is made, as well as by those who urge it.

The following circular—appealing for aid on behalf of the "Endowment" and "Residence" Funds of the New Bishopric of Southwell—has lately been issued with the sanction and authority of the Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham, under the direction of a committee of Clergymen, as an invitation of the Laity to join in a movement originally commenced with the object of testifying to the Bishop of Lincoln the feeling of warm sympathy and gratitude, called for by his Lordship's noble defence of the Church. Its success will best testify to the extent and genuineness of this feeling:—

"The clerical testimonial to the Bishop of Lincoln, which in the first place took the form of 'An Address of Thanks,' signed by over a thousand clergymen *out* of the Diocese of Lincoln and by over six hundred *within* his Lordship's diocese, has now assumed a more substantial and practical shape—one in which the Faithful Laity are also invited to join—by the organisation of a Committee for promoting the establishment of the new Bishopric of Southwell, which is to comprise the counties of Derby and Nottingham.

"It was felt by many supporters of the original movement that, in recognition of the Bishop of Lincoln's noble action against the Burials Bill, something more substantial than a mere vote of thanks should be offered to him, in which the earnest-minded *laity* as well as the clergy might take part.

"Those who value the life and the services of the Bishop of Lincoln have now an opportunity of doing something to prolong that life, as far as human agency can effect this, and consequently of securing his prolonged services to the Church at large, by responding to this affecting appeal in behalf of the sub-division of his diocese, the burden of which is too great for him.

"The promoters of the address of thanks received many communications from all parts of the country, suggesting that some definite steps should be taken to manifest a practical interest in and sympathy with the work of founding the Bishopric which is intended to relieve the Bishops of two great and overgrown dioceses in the Midlands, Lichfield and Lincoln; * and it was felt that no offering would be so acceptable to the Bishop of Lincoln as a fund which he could dedictate towards the endowment of the Bishopric of Southwell, which only needs monetary help to be created, and would be of great service to the Sees of Lincoln and Lichfield, and consequently to a considerable portion of the Midland Counties of England. The fact that the memorial to the late Bishop of Lichfield—whose indefatigable energy was yet hardly equal to the work of a diocese comprising three counties—has taken the form of a college to be called after him, rather than of the endowment of another Bishopric, renders it the more incumbent on those who value the life of an equally eminent prelate to look primarly to the lessening of his labours.

"Already has a very fitting Incumbent of the diocese of Lincoln offered to act as the recipient of such a fund, the Rev. C. W. Markham, of Saxby Rectory, Barton-on-Humber; and from the nature of the response to the original movement, the Address Committee are confident that the publication of this design and of the name of an authorised receiver are alone required to secure a large harvest of help from the *laity*, as well as the clergy, of England towards such a fitting offering to the present great Bishop of Lincoln.

"The sum of £38,000 is still required for the endowment of the Bishopric of Southwell, besides a further sum for an episcopal residence, towards which the Dowager Duchess of Cleveland has subscribed £500, an example which it is hoped will be followed by other *ladies*. Whilst the clergy and laity, therefore, are invited to subscribe towards the first Fund, ladies are invited to subscribe towards the second, which would be a noble offering to the Church as well as to the Bishop of Lincoln.

"Subscriptions of any amount, great or small, may at once be sent to Mr. Markham, and will be dedicated either to the Endowment or Resident Fund, at the pleasure of contributors.

"Feast of St. Bartholomew, 1880."

* The superficial extent of the two dioceses of Lincoln and Lichfield is considerably over four million acres, the acreage of Lincoln diocese being by far the largest of the home dioceses, viz., 2,302,814 acres, while that of Lichfield exceeds that of York. Lichfield is also one of the six home diocese (including London) having a population—according to the last census—of over 1,350,000, which the coming census will show to have been very largely augmented within the last ten years,

ON FAITH.

How blest are they who walk by faith,
And fix their thoughts above;
Where Jesus lives to intercede
For those who share His love.

Faith rends the veil 'twixt earth and heaven,
And brings the Saviour near;
Fills him with joy and peace within,
And drives away his fear.

Truth is the glass through which he looks
On things unknown to sight,
And, seen by faith, all heaven appears
Enrobed with glorious light.

Faith is the helm with which he steers
By Christ, his guiding star;
With Him in view he safely sails,
Nor dreads the tempest's war.

Faith is the shield the Christian rears
When fiery darts appal,
Which moistened with his Saviour's blood
Can even quench them all.

Faith is the staff the Christian holds
To lull his toil and care,
And when he meets a throne of grace
He leans on this in prayer.

Lord, make our faith more clear and strong,
And that it ne'er may yield,
Dwell Thou within our hearts by faith,
Our Life, our Light, our Shield.

Surbiton. DANIEL BAGOT, D.D., Dean, &c.

——:o:——

The Dean of Ripon has addressed a letter to the *Record*, in which he says—"Compromises, affiliation, and co-operation with men of the same Church as ourselves, but who have openly avowed tenets which to us appear to be false doctrine and, more or less, 'another Gospel,'—this is the paramount and the most subtle danger to which the Evangelical body of the present day is exposed. I impugn no man's motives, especially when I feel sure that some from whom I seem to differ are personally, in themselves, my superiors in talent and godliness, but their public acts and teachings, if we believe them to be mistaken and dangerous, we are at liberty to criticise or to censure, without any breach of charity and brotherly love. At the approaching Church Congress this interesting subject is proposed for discussion by the essayists and speakers—'The Communion of Saints.' Under the principle of amalgamation of all parties it appears that three men—advanced High Churchmen—together with two or three pronounced Evangelicals, are selected to read or speak for the edification of the public assembled, and, in fact, before the whole Church. Is it not a significant fact that neither of these three would allow one of the other three to preach in his pulpit? For myself, I would quite as readily allow one of the apostate English Roman Catholic Cardinals to preach in my pulpit as I would allow one of these Anglican priests to do so."

The Bishop of Oxford is better for his rest, though still far from well. He is suffering from the same disease which ultimately proved fatal to Sir Gilbert Scott.

The parish church of Westerdale, Yorkshire, has just been enriched with a stained-glass windnw of three lights, the gift of the Rev. J. Rathbone Ellis, the rector, in memory of his late wife and daughter. It is from the studio of Powell Brothers, Leeds and London.

The Dean of Carlisle has been protesting with characteristic vigour against the attendance of Low Churchmen at Church Congresses. The *Church Times* rebukes his "bitter sectarian tone," which it charitably attributes to the fact that "the fibres of the brain undergo a species of ossification in extreme old age, and it is then impossible to get a new idea into it."

There is a rumour that the long delay in filling the canonry of Worcester, vacant by the death of Canon Seymour, arises from a difference of opinion between her Majesty and the Prime Minister as to the recipient, the Queen being anxious for one of her chaplains, who is a very good preacher, to be presented; and Mr Gladstone having nominated a well-known West-country clergyman, a not inconsiderable author. Canon Melville, a relative of the Earl of Dudley, would like to exchange his titular for a substantial dignity, but W. E. G. does not see it.

Even the most determined opponents of the Bishop of Lincoln are ready to acknowledge the exalted purity of his character, his vast learning, and his unfailing munificence; of the last Dr. Wordsworth has just furnished an additional proof by presenting new and more suitable premises, at a personal cost of nearly £8,000, to the Lincoln Theological College, which has been conducted with great success since it was revived in 1873 by Chancellor Benson, now Bishop of Truro.

The Dean of Llandaff (Dr. Vaughan) has been nominated select preacher at Cambridge on October 24 and 31.

It is not a little remarkable that ugly churches are rarely burnt down, whereas the destruction by fire of parish church of St. Mary, Whitechapel, is at least the third instance within the last decade of churches recently erected being so destroyed. St. Mary's, Whitechapel, was built in 1876, almost entirely at the cost of Mr. Octavius E. Coope, M.P., and one remarkable feature was a pulpit outside the church. The present rector is on the point of going to Stepney in succession to Mr. Bardesley, and it will be difficult to find a man with energy and vigour enough to undertake such a parish, with the superadded burden of begging for money for a new church.

The ostensible reason for abandoning the Lourdes Pilgrimage, *e.g.*, that Cardinal Manning had at the last moment discouraged it as it might cause political complication in France, is a ridiculous pretence. The real truth is that the pilgrims have not come forward. In spite of the ostentatious patronage of many notables, benediction of the Cardinal, and the intended presence of the Duke and Duchess of Norfolk, there has not been any adequate response to Lord Archibald Douglas's appeal. The English Catholics are becoming more rational, and see that the days for such fantastic crusades are past and gone. Nor half the necessary number for the pilgrimage turned up. The journey was, I believe, to have been "personally conducted" by Messrs. Cook. The postponement of the expedition from June to September, in order to avoid the heat of summer (which surely was a reason "of the earth earthy"), sufficiently showed the hollowness of the whole business.

The council of the Church Guilds Union, in their annual report, January, 1880, say:—"The Guild . . . . of St. Matthew, in the east of London, has engaged in the very valuable enterprise of encountering scepticism and infidelity by means of lectures and discussions, to which are gived the broadest invitations."

The following petition to the Archbishop of Canterbury for a Bishop to supervise Continental chaplaincies has been sent to us for insertion:—"That whereas a strong desire for more direct and complete Episcopal control has long existed in the minds of the English clergy ministering to their countrymen in Northern and Central Europe; and whereas this desire has grown with their experience of the difficulties incident to their isolated position, and their deprivation of the ordinary means of direction, and a support which are provided in the regular organisation of the Church at home; whereas these and many like discouragements are both felt to be a hindrance to their own actual work, and are such as to deter many from engaging, either permanently or for a time, in a service both fully recognised and demanding great ability and judgment for its discharge; whereas, there are many questions which either arise only abroad or there assume a form for which home experience furnishes no precedent; whereas, above all, the religious life of those who come to reside in a foreign country is beset with peculiar dangers; whereas, lastly, a proposal made some time ago, and generally known as the Heligoland bishopric scheme, or the alternative of providing an exclusively Continental suffragan to the Lord Bishop of London, would supply the need so widely and painfully felt, your petitioners humbly pray that your Grace would be pleased to sanction a united and vigorous attempt to carry one of these schemes into effect, or to suggest some other which might seem better calculated to secure the object in view. And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

———:o:———

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Boyd, Rev. Canon, vicar of Arncliffe; Archdeacon of Craven.
Daubeny, Rev. John, rector of Catsfield.
Fowell, Rev. R. G., assooiation secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the South-western District of England.
Johnston, Rev. J. F., rector of Wasing.
Powell, Rev. William Bassett, curate of Claverdon and Norton Lindsey.
Ratcliffe, Rev. C. B., incumbent of Christ Church, Weymouth.
Richards, Rev. George, rector of Marlingford, Norfolk.
Vawdrey, Rev. Daniel, rector of Areley Kings.
Wade-Dalton, Rev. G. Frederick, vicar of Coverham and Horsehouse, Bedale.
Warwick, Rev. Arthur James, curate of St. John-in-Bebwardinr, Worcester.

——:o:——

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bayne, Robert Bicknell, (drowned in the Ovens River, when driving to a service), incumbent of All Saints', Bright, Australia, and son of the Rev. R. Bayne, vicar of Kingsey, Bucks, England, aged 43; also Robert Linnæus Bayne, aged 12, and John Polglaise James Bayne, aged 5, his only sons, on June 27.

Burd, Rev. William Stevens, M.A., Ch. Ch., Oxon, vicar of Preston Gubbalds, Shrewsbury, on the 27th ult.

Fenton, Rev. Samuel, M.A., rector of St. Mary's, Wavertree, Liverpool, at Sandown Park, Wavertree, Liverpool, on the 26th ult., aged 84.

Scurfield, Rev. Robert Grey, vicar of Frocester, younger son of G. T. Scurfield, Esq., Hurworth-upon-Tees, at Holcombe Cottage, Minchinhampton, of rapid consumption four months after his marriage, on the 29th ult., aged 36.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE WORDS OF CHRIST.

By the Rev. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday Afternoon, August 15, 1880.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away."—St. Matt. xxiv. 35.

THE question whether these solemn words should be closely, or rather exclusively, connected with those which precede and those which follow them, is a question of practical, and not merely of literary, interest. The same occurs in the middle of our Lord's great prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the end of the world—two events which, as it is plain from an examination of the whole of the discourse, were very distinct from each other in the mind of the Divine speaker, although, at this time, they would have been closely connected, perhaps even identified, in the minds of the disciples. But our Lord knew, as he surveyed the centuries stretching away before Him, that Jerusalem would be destroyed before the then living generation had passed to its account. What the time of the last world-embracing catastrophe in a much more distant future would be was known neither to men nor angels, but only to the Father in heaven; and thus His saying, "My words shall not pass away," may have been partly intended to be remembered some forty years later, when Jerusalem would have perished, while the end of the world would not have yet come. They might have been a provision against a moment of disappointment which he then foresaw, and which he thus furnished with a proof that He had foreseen it, and that He was still, as always, certain of the future.

But that this was the main object of the words can be affirmed with less certainty than would be the case if our Lord had deigned to become incarnate in the Western world, and was speaking as a Western, or Greek, or Roman, to Western men. A Western discourse, if it is to be persuasive, is like a living creature. Every part of it is organically connected with the rest, and in dealing with anyone of its several parts we have a right to presume fully on this connection; but an Eastern discourse is, as often as not, a collection of sayings which have the loosest connection with each other, which are intended to do their work of persuasion, as it might be done by an assortment of epigrams or of proverbs, which resemble in their entirety not a living organism, but a heap of polished stones, each of which is, in itself, perfect and beautiful, while it has no necessary connection with the rest. Compare the Suralis or discourses in the Koran of Mohammed with the speeches of celebrated Greeks who are reported in Thucydides, or with an oration of Cicero, or with a parliamentary utterance of some great statesman in our own day, and you will see what I mean. In the one there is scarcely any traceable method or connection; in the other, all is connected with a view to producing on the mind the effect of highly-organised argument. St. Paul, indeed, was an Eastern by birth; but the incidents of his education and life, and the requirements of his work, made him more than half a Western; and thus, to go no farther, the Epistle to the Romans is largely constructed upon the methods and modes of that which belong to the Greek or Western world. But our Lord in His condescension addressed, first of all, purely Eastern audiences while keeping His eye upon that larger and world-wide audience that would wait on Him through the coming centuries. He spoke to men as an Eastern man would speak, and, therefore, it is impossible, we may reverently say, to assume that close and exclusive connection between one sentence in his discourse and another which would be natural in a speaker of the Western world.

Now, this observation would be pedantic in a sermon if it were not justified by the practical result to which it at once conducts us; for, if it is accurate, we see at once that we cannot assume between the words of the text and the words which precede and which follow them any such close and exclusive connection as would oblige us to suppose that our Lord was thinking only or mainly about what He was teaching as to the destruction of Jerusalem or as to the end of the world. "My word shall not pass away." As He utters the saying the the horizon widens; it widens so as to include the whole range of the words of Christ. "My words shall not pass away." As He utters the words, we feel—if it is not irreverent to say as much—we feel that this is one of His most commanding and most inclusive utterances; that in it is lofty consciousness of His divine and eternal person, and that His world-redeeming work is most clearly exhibited. Our Lord here contrasts the permanence, the indestructibility of His words with the perishable nature of the material universe: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away." This contrast was familiar to the Jewish mind; and it would have been understood to claim for our Lord's teaching the highest imaginable authority. Jeremiah had said to God's covenants with David and with the Levites, that they were as unalterable as the succession of day and night: "Thus saith the Lord; If ye can break the covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers."

And in later years, the leading Levites of Palestine, and the great Jewish Alexandrian writer, Philo, had taught constantly that the law, as a whole, differed from the material world in being unchangeable and imperishable. Philo, in particular, contended that if the letter of the law had, in any respect, to be surrendered, the spirit which it enshrined belonged to pure and indestructible truth; and our Lord sanctioned this teaching, though in a fair higher sense, by repeating it Himself. When, in the Sermon on the Mount, He is going to show how the law would have a loftier meaning in the Church of Christ than it ever had had before, He begins by deprecating the common Jewish misapprehension that He was attempting to abolish it. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." And then He adds, "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fiulfilled." And again, when, after the parable of the Unjust Steward, our Lord had been derided by the covetous Pharisees as the teacher of what they thought fanciful and unheard-of novelties, He took occasion to say that the law and the prophets, as understood by the Jews, had lasted until John the Baptist; that, since then, the kingdom of God had been preached; but that the inmost spirit of the law was so absolutely part of the teaching and life of the new kingdom that it was easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fail. And in such sayings our Lord would have been understood to be using the accredited language of the synagogue about the law; but what must have been the impression produced when He proceeded to apply this very language, or rather, stronger language, to His own teaching? "Heaven and earth shall pass away"—not the law given amid the thunders of Sinai—"but My words shall not pass away." Other teachers have desired an immortality for their words or works; but true genius has known too well the fate that, with the advance of time, overtakes all merely human workmanship to venture to predict it. Shakespeare never for a moment supposed that he would be what he is to-day to the English and the German peoples, but our Lord, as it seemed, a Galilean peasant, does not merely aspire; He foretells. He foretells for His words an imperishable life; He makes a claim which is most assuredly the very essence of madness, if it be not a simple and sober truth. "My words shall not pass away."

Let us try to observe any characteristics of our Lord's reported language which may enable us to understand this confident prediction.

That which strikes us first of all in the words of our Lord Jesus Christ is the authority which speaks in them, or rather which is their very soul. An Evangelist said that our Lord's public teaching was so acceptable because "He taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes." The scribes were anxious to bring their countrymen to look at the law in the light of the traditional interpretations, of which they were the guardians and exponents; but if the scribes were to do this, it was not enough for them to say, "This is right, and this is wrong." They found themselves confronted with the difficulties which present themselves to any merely human teacher entrusted with the task of recommending a doctrine he believes to be true to the attention, to the convictions, of the human mind. He knows how solid, how many-sided is the silent resistance which awaits him; he feels his way gently; he explains tentatively; he explores, perhaps, tentatively the field of discussion; he begins by trying to stimulate interest and inquiry; and then, putting it on the right track to gain over the various faculties of his audience, he appeals to their understanding, to their sense of the fitness of things, to their sense of duty, to their sense of truth, to their common-sense, as the case may require. He marshalls his reasons: he explains them; he sets them one by one before the mind which he desires to win. He lays siege to it as if it were a fortress he were bent on capturing, and as if he were directing an intellectual battery against its defences and outworks; and when argument seems to fail him, he appeals perhaps, to sentiment, to feeling, to passion. He may prevail as a poet if he cannot prevail as a reasoner; but he cannot rest until he has done what he may to compel assent to the doctrine which he believes to be true. This is what the scribes did in their way. They were masters of a kind of reasoning, which, however little suited to Western and to modern tastes, was in its way subtle and effective. It was the instrument with which they worked, and they only succeeded at all if they could get people to attend to it. This, too, is what Socrates did after another and a different fashion. He went about Athens asking people questions designed to make them uncomfortable, with a view to getting them to inquire, or, at least, to set them thinking. It was all very well as far as it went; but at his best Socrates was but the apostle of some sublime uncertainties. He raised questions which he did not venture to answer. He made it his business not to administer intellectual truth which he did not himself possess, but to get people to question intellectual errors.

With our Lord it was otherwise. He, generally speaking, takes no account whatever of this means of producing conviction which, in merely human speakers, commands success. He is careful, indeed, in His vast charity, to teach as men are able to bear; but if they are able, He is indifferent to the inward disposition which His words arouse, He ignores, or he defies it; He makes no concessions to passion; He awes rather than satisfies the first movement of resentment. He does not reason—at least, as a rule; He affirms a truth, knowing that it is the truth, leaving it to make its own way in the soul of man. He teaches Nicodemus that a

man must be born again if he is to see the kingdom of God; and Nicodemus asks how such a thing as a new birth is abstractively possible. Instead of answering the question directly our Lord re-affirms what He has just said, only more strongly and with an added reference to baptism as the instrument of the new birth, what He had taught before, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And when the Jews in the synagogue of Capernaum took exception to His saying, "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world," and asked, "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" our Lord only repeated more emphatically what He had said before: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life." The self-justifying phrase of the old Hebrew prophets was always "Thus saith the Lord." The prophets distinguished carefully between themselves and the real Author of the message which they bore to mankind; they effaced themselves. It has been well said, "They effaced themselves by their appeal to the high authority whose organs they were." On our Lord's lips the common expression, which is reported to have been used by Him more than seventy times, is, "Verily, verily, I say unto you," or, "Believe in Me," "Come unto Me," "Keep My commandments," "Follow Me," "I am the Way," "I am the Truth," "I am the Life." He feels that He has an ancient welcome prepared for Him within the soul of man, that He possesses the key to its wants and to its mysteries; that within that, as no other teacher can be, He will be at home, and will be owned as its rightful Lord. Certainly He is careful to state that His doctrine is not His, meaning only His in such a sense as to be opposed to that of His Father, that He receives it from His Father, that He speaks as the Father prescribes; but this and similar language proves, not that He is the merely human organ of a divine authority distinct from Himself; it illustrates His own words, "I and My Father are one thing." In a human teacher the phrases, "My doctrine," "My word," would be an impertinence. They are justified in our Lord's case by His sayings about His Divine person. They belong to that commanding authority with which He approaches the soul of man. If His teaching is mysterious, if it enforces truths which stretch away into infinity, and which we have no means whatever of verifying, He tells us that He has seen what He teaches from everlasting as He sees it now. "He that cometh from above is above all, and what He hath seen and heard that He justifieth." This, then, is the first reason for the permanence of the words of Christ. They met a great want in human nature. When a man is strong and in good spirits he likes to deal with the speculations of the day; but when he is sick and suffering, and has another state of existence looming very indistinctly before him, he desires truth—truth, too, which dares to assert itself as truth; which knows its responsibilities, its frontiers, its premisses, its consequences, its foes, and its supporters. To talk at the bedside of a dying man as if you were half doubtful about everything, but, above all, of offending, however so little, the literary susceptibilities of some cultivated sceptic, would be clearly impossible. A religion may have—undoubtedly it has—a literary side; but, speaking broadly, literature is one thing, and religion is another, and an infinitely higher and more sacred thing than literature. It was because our Lord's words went straight to the very heart and soul of man that He showed Himself to be the Master—as He was the centre and the object of the absolute religion, and He gives us a warrant that what He says will not pass away.

And a second characteristic of our Lord's words is their elevation. They rise high above the prejudices and the passions of the people on whose goodwill a human teacher in His position would have felt himself to be entirely dependent. Contrast Him with the great names in ancient philosophy, who kept their best thoughts about truth for a few choice spirits, for a select coterie of friends, but who flattered, while they despised, the superstitions of the multitude from lack of courage to tell them what they believed to be the truth. Not so did Jesus. The eloquent motto of His words was, "The poor have the Gospel preached to them." As if to atone for centuries of a world-wide neglect, He sought the soul of man in quarters where its very existence had been studiously ignored. He shed the light of the truths which He had brought from heaven on multitudes to whom all access to the highest human wisdom of the day was denied. He went up and down the villages and lanes of Galilee, scattering the Divine seed by the wayside, and upon stony ground and among thorns; but content to know that, however it was received, justice was done to the long-neglected claims of the poor. "To the poor the Gospel is preached." Yes; but the poor did not dictate to the Divine Teacher what the Gospel was to be; it was addressed not to their wishes, but to their wants. It set aside their most cherished prejudices; it proposed to make them happy and blessed in spite of themselves, and by means which were very unlike any that they imagined. In His place, a merely human teacher would almost certainly have become the object first, and then the victim, of an unbounded popularity. He would have sunk the Messianic hope into the level of political aspiration for national enfranchisement; He would have given His teaching a merely earthly colouring which would have recommended it to the spirit of the time; but Jesus loved the people far too well to flatter their illusions. His doctrine rose high above the atmosphere in which those illusions grew. He bade them follow Him, not to earthly conquest and national prosperity, but

first to the Cross and then to heaven; and it took many a year ere the people discovered that He was their best and their truest friend. His teaching rose high above the prejudices of the people; but it was not less raised above the current opinions of the well-informed and so-called religious classes of the time. Read the Sermon on the Mount in order to see the force and extent of this elevation. There we have a series of contrasts between the letter of the old law or the letter of the precepts of the Jewish religion and the new Divine ideal of conduct which our Lord was placing before the conscience of man. "It has been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill." Jesus does not repeal; He enormously extends the range of the commandment, "I say unto you, Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment." "Again it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery." Our Lord explains the precept to relate not merely to acts, but desires; He carries it into that region of motive and inclination of which a mistaken morality knows nothing. "I say unto you that whosoever looketh upon a woman to desire her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Again, it has been said, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement." Jesus, as the herald of a new morality, disallows divorce altogether: "I say unto you that whosoever shall put away his wife, save for the reason which would have made the marriage contract void from the beginning, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever marries her that is divorced committeth adultery." And again it has been said by them of old time, "Thou shalt not perjure thyself, but shall perform to the Lord thine oaths." Jesus will have no rash oaths whatever. "Swear not at all by anything, either in earth or heaven; let your words be simple, transparent, sincere." "The old popular rule was 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth;' but I say unto you, Resist not evil: if a man strikes you on the one cheek, offer him the other: if he takes an unfair advantage, let him, if he will, take another." It is better to suffer than to inflict injury, better to yield than to retaliate. The old saying ran, "Love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy;" but it has had its day. This saying He proclaims—"I say unto you, Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you, that you may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." Here we see our Lord's relation to the current views of conduct among the well-informed and religious classes of His countrymen. But His teaching rises no less above the roughest and largest wisdom of the whole of the ancient world. The best and truest sayings which the human conscience holds, the light of revelation has left for the guidance of human life. There is the noble saying, "I am a man; I deem nothing that is human alien to me." Our Lord requires something more than negative welcome. He bids man love his brother man even to the extent, if need be, of dying for him. "A new commandment give I unto you, that ye should love one another as I have loved you." There is the warning, so full of wisdom and of tenderness, that children shall be treated with the respect which is due to their innocence of the world. "*Maxima debetur pueris reverentia.*" But our Lord puts this upon higher ground. Each child, He says, has an angel companion, who gazes incessantly on the face of God. Woe to the man who leads one of them astray. "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones: I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." And again there is the saying that a man in adversity is an object of reverence. This was a great advance upon the barbarous idea that adversity always implied some preceding wickedness, and that it warranted others in insulting or despising the unfortunate; but our Lord does not merely require men not to despise the unhappy; He makes misfortune the object of some of His choicest benedictions; He blesses the poor and the persecuted: He invites those who would follow Him most closely to associate themselves with the suffering; He makes Himself the recipient of the kindness, of the honour, of the substantial assistance which is given to those who suffer:—"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me." The ancient world said that to prefer life to honour is the worst of crimes. Our Lord raises us high above the narrow idea of honour, which was all that was meant in such sayings as these. He thinks less of the public acts which common opinion condemns, and which forfeit the respect or the goodwill of our fellow men, than of the private acts which cause shame and confusion before God. He warns us that the law of honour is not always a safe guide; that often that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God; that thoughts or desires whose existence is unsuspected by the world may soil and may defile the soul; that those of whom all men speak well are really objects of compassion; that it were better to forfeit the whole world than to lose the soul. As we listen to Him we are conscious always and everywhere of a matchless elevation. He is far above his countrymen; far above the wisest wisdom of the time; far above the wisest wisdom of the ages that have succeeded, and of which He has not been directly or indirectly the author. As we listen to Him we feel that He lives and speaks in an atmosphere to which we poor sinful men only ascend at rare intervals, and by considerable efforts. As a Teacher, no less than as our Redeemer and our Lord, He invites the praises of His Church: "Thou only, O Christ! with the Holy Ghost, are most high in the glory of God the Father."

And since He is thus above the level of human thought His words will live. Time effaces that

which belongs only and fundamentally to the mind of man; but here is a teaching which bears upon it the imprint of a higher origin, and of a more commanding standpoint. The centuries may pass; but *it* will not pass away.

And a third characteristic of the words of Christ is — if I am rightly using the expression — their awful depth. As we have seen, many of them were addressed to the people, and they were correspondingly simple in form. They were without any of the apparatus of learning, or of the pretence of culture. They attracted by their studied simplicity. The common people heard Him gladly. They were of such a character that, at first sight, each hearer felt that he could make them his own, as if they were the sayings of a human parent or a human friend. Each hearer felt at first as if he fully understood them, and saw all their bearings, and had sounded their meaning, and had only to lay up in his heart and mind what was at once so simple and so encouraging. This was the first and a very natural impression about the words of Jesus Christ; but when they were laid up in memory, or taken down in writing, it was soon seen that there was a great deal more in them than had appeared to be the case at first. It was seen that beyond and beneath the first or superficial meaning, there was a second, at once deeper and more adequate, and that, perhaps, there was a third. It was seen that they might be worked like a mine through a life-time of study and prayer, through centuries of contemplation and discussion, and yet leave a believing soul or a believing church with the conviction that they were as far as ever from being exhausted. It was seen that their seeming simplicity was but the measure of their real, their marvellous depth. Take, for instance, that gracious saying about Himself: "The Son of Man shall give His life a ransom for many." It seemed to His disciples that He was speaking of an unselfishness carried to the point of dying, under what circumstances they could not yet divine, for other men; but we read these pregnant words in the light of His apostle's epistles. We know that they preached the great doctrine of the atonement, the doctrine of propitiation through faith in His blood, of His being "made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him," of our being "reconciled to God by the death of His Son," of our being "bought with a price"—the blood of the Lamb without blemish and immaculate—from the realms of sin and death.

Again, our Lord, speaking in the Synagogue of Capernaum, said, "My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed." The Jews could only ask, "How could this Man give us His flesh to eat?" If the disciples were sure that He could do what He said, their sense of His meaning was also, as we know, sufficiently indefinite. Only when long afterwards He was near the close of His earthly life; when, in those moments of transcendent joy which heralded the great agony, He took bread and wine and blessed it, and gave, and said, "This is My body; and this is My blood," only then did they understand how His Divine humanity was to restore and to support our fallen nature, and to reunite it throughout the ages of Christendom to our Father and our God.

And again, what an entire theology lies in those words uttered to the sorrowing sister of Lazarus, "I am the Resurrection and the Life; he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die." On the ears of millions of believing mourners these blessed words have fallen, and each as he listened has seemed to gain a new sense of the power of the risen Christ, to catch some previously unrecognised rays of that light which alone lightens the darkness of the tomb.

And, again, there is that solemn warning, "At such a day and hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh." A child does not understand this; to understand it is needed the experience of a life; but who can have lived even a few years and not have seen again and again how it is verified. Surely we here to-day cannot forget that since last Sunday two prebendaries of this Cathedral Church have been called to their account: one sinking into the grave in the fulness of years and of labour; the other called away in a moment beneath the waters of a northern lake—called away from his ripe and as yet unshattered strength; called away from his life of work, from his large family, from his earthly anticipations and interests into the awful and blessed presence of Christ.

Our Lord's words have depths in them which are explored sometimes by divinity, sometimes by the experience of a life, but which always elude complete investigation; they have about them that character of infinitude which belongs to the more than human mind from which they proceed. Their depth is seen in their extraordinary and enduring ascendancy over the best of men at the distance of these many centuries. He said to His apostles "Go, teach all nations," and they went. He still has the power of pouring His own Divine enthusiasm for the higher good of mankind into the souls of others by means of these imperishable words. They still do move the soul of man in its very inmost recesses. Multitudes are living throughout Christendom the whole direction and manner of whose lives has been changed by their searching, their restless power. Nothing like this is true of any merely human speech or writing. We quote the great chiefs of thought, the great students of human nature, but they only illustrate our meaning when we want an authority; they do not control us in spite of ourselves; they do not revolutionise our inmost lives; they do not raise us from earth to heaven. One only can do this, He who sees into the depths of the nature which He created before He made it His own, and who accordingly spoke as man never spake. Yes, "My words," He says, "shall not pass away."

There are loud voices, there are accomplished writers who say that it is only a question of time, that the words of Christ, too, are destined to meet the fate of all merely human words, to contribute an element of whatever value to the sum total of human thought, and then to die away and be forgotten. But these speakers and writers never answer an important and inevitable inquiry — namely, What is to take their place? For, human nature being what it is, Christ's words answer all demands; they fill the void which most assuredly cannot be neglected or ignored. Whence come we, what are we, what are our relations to the unseen and the Eternal? What is the true rule of our lives here? Whither are we going? What is to follow the last earthly scene of death? Jesus, our Lord, has answered all these questions and they are the most interesting questions—incomparably the most interesting — that can engage the attention of a thoughtful man. He tells us that we come from God; that we are immortal souls, that through Himself we have access to the Father; that His precepts are the one true and perfect rule by which we ought to live; that after death comes Resurrection and the Judgment and Hell and Heaven. But we turn to the masters of the new philosophy, and ask them how they answer the questions which surround us; and each and all of them have but one answer: "We cannot tell whence we come, why we are here, whither we are bent, how we ought to live, whether there is any unseen being with whom we can have relations, and what relations are possible." Of each and all they are profoundly ignorant. Nay; they would fain persuade us, if they could, that these questions — our interest in which is the very certificate of our possessing a higher than merely animal existence—should not be asked at all. Is it possible that such systems as these should take the place of the words of Christ in the hearts and minds of men? No! it is impossible. For a moment these theories may dazzle a generation or some part of it, by the brilliancy and audacity with which they are set forth, but in the long run the higher claims of the human soul itself will make themselves heard above the din of thousands of laboratories, and the words which have thrilled a willing Christendom with awe and with love for two thousand years will re-assert their empire. "My words shall not pass away." Write down these words, brethren, in the title pages of the New Testament, that when you, each of you, open that blessed book, they may remind you of what you are doing, that you are approaching the one Teacher whose authority is not, cannot be impaired, by the lapse of time. Write them down, fathers and mothers, but especially you Christian mothers, and may you never forget to teach your children, more carefully and thoroughly than anything that merely commands success in earthly life, those words which are more precious than ever before in the hour of death, and which are triumphantly verified and justified beyond the veil. Write them down, I pray you, in your books, and pray God by His Holy Spirit to write them in your hearts. Aye, gentle and simple, lettered and unlearned, old and young, that they may help you while the day of trial lasts, to set your foot indeed upon the rock, and to order your goings! Never in the morning leave your chamber without asking, "What do these blessed words or any one of them say to me for guidance, or support, or instruction, or warning in the work of the day?" Never lie down at night without bringing what has been thought, and said, and done to be judged of by these words of the Divine Teacher, and that you may ask His pardon where you have gone astray, or thank Him for His grace where you have been enabled to conquer. To make these words the rule of life and thought must needs be the effort of every true Christian. God grant we may make it while yet we can, and may find at our last hour, from a personal experience, that the words which alone do not pass away are also the words of eternal life.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1880.

AFTER the discussion we have had on Circumcision, the token or sacrament of the Covenant of faith and promise made by God to Abraham, we consider ourselves fortunate in being able to print Mr. R. Galbraith's learned and well-reasoned Paper on Infantile Baptism: because we think the two rites should be considered and compared together, as this author has to some extent done. If he would apply the same learning and logical acumen in examining the validity of the Sacrament of Faith as he has applied to that of Responsibility, he would confer a very substantial boon on all Christians. It must be remembered that, however disparagingly St. Paul spoke of trusting in the outward rite of Circumcision as the Jews did, the Grace and Covenant of which it was the token occupies a very large space in all of his Epistles, especially

in those addressed to the Romans and Galatians. "And this I (Paul) say, that the Covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." It is a fact that Circumcision is attended by great Sanitary, if not Moral, advantages, and on this score it is now frequently recommended by eminent medical men. We hope shortly to be able to give detailed evidence of its value in this respect. Meanwhile, in order to remove prejudice, we should be glad if Mr. Galbraith, or some equally able and unbiassed theologian, would examine the theological bearings of the question. As regards Infant Baptism, we regard it as no more irrational than that minors in the eye of the law should by their Guardians or next friends, enter into covenants and agreements concerning secular matters. Oftentimes in quite early life a child will develop a faculty of trust and belief. It is very desirable, despite the views of some School Boards, that all children, from their earliest years, should be taught the Word of God, and it is impossible for man to say how early in life a child may be able to fulfil the agreement and vows entered into at Baptism, and thus obtain the blessings of the rite.

INFANT BAPTISM PROVED FROM SCRIPTURE.

A Paper by the Rev. R. GALBRAITH, M.A., Author of "Antidote to Plymouth Brethren Tendencies;" also of "Facts and Thoughts Concerning the Moody and Sankey Movement."

It is a happy sign of the times that religion is at present engaging a greater amount of thought and interest among all classes than it has done for many years. One circumstance, perhaps unavoidably arising from this, is that many points of belief and practice, considered settled beyond dispute by our fathers, are now questioned. Some starting from great truths, and, judging by what they term common sense, form opinions opposed to other truths; and such persons, by their position in the social scale, by their readiness of speech, by their unhesitating confidence in the soundness of their own views, by the weight of their moral, and in some respects Christian, character obtain for their opinions greater acceptance than such opinions should meet with; erroneous views are thus spread, perplexity and doubt caused to some, indifference and infidelity sometimes follow. The existence of such a state of mind in some calls for an effort to set forth as briefly and succinctly as possible true and Scriptural views on such points.

The subject to be taken up in this paper is one upon which a great diversity of opinion exists in certain localities. Some, as Quakers, think Infant Baptism useless. Baptists say it is unscriptural. Some laymen of considerable repute assert that it is merely an ordinance of men. It is intended in this essay to consider:

First. Whether Infant Baptism was an Apostolical practice or not.

Secondly. To make a few remarks on the conclusions arrived at.

I. In considering whether Infant Baptism was practiced by the Apostles or not, we turn to the Scriptures, and are there met by the fact that we do not find any passage in which it is expressly stated that infants were or were not baptized. In the absence of any direct assertion on the subject, we must look for indirect evidence. *The question thus is one of probability*, and may be put in this way,—Which is more probable, that the Apostles did or did not baptize infants? And here, in order to guard against a mistake some fall into, it is well to remember that questions are not to be considered matters of minor importance because they can only be decided by considering which of two or more opinions is the most probable. Questions daily submitted by judges to juries are not treated as insignificant, even though juries in forming their opinion have to consider which of several opinions is most probable. Bishop Butler has most truly said that "*Probability is the guide of life.*" That it is so every one must see who takes the trouble of considering why he believes one thing or another, why he acts in this or that manner. We act daily on probable evidence in all we do or say, and we are responsible to God for judging according to the best of our ability. We daily partake of food, because it will *probably* appease or prevent hunger, though it is possible it may have poison in it. It takes not from the importance of Infant Baptism or any other subject to say that the question is in reality one of probability. Those who believe Jesus came from God do so because they believe it more probable that One Who wrought miracles like His, and Who taught like Him, came from God than not. Some who saw His miracles, no less than we do, considered it more probable that His miracles were wrought directly by divine power immediately exercised by Christ, than by such power as medical men exercise when patients are cured by God's blessing on their skill and prescriptions.

Keeping in mind this principle, that probability must be our guide, let us now return to our subject, and consider some passages in Scripture which bear upon it.

(a) We learn from Acts xvi. 15, and 1 Cor. i. 16, that households were baptized, also that on the conversion of the Philippian jailer "he and *all his* were baptized straightway." (Acts xvi. 33.) Now in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we are justified in concluding that the baptism of these households were examples of the course generally followed by the Apostles in regard to baptism instead of exceptions to their custom. It would evidenly be presumptuous in us to say that these recorded cases were exceptions to the Apostolic rule, instead of examples of it; we are therefore doubtless right in concluding that households were constantly baptised by Apostolic authority. Now if it is more probable than not that there were infants in any of these households, it must be in the same degree more probable than not that infants were baptized. Those who, believing households were in general baptized, think infants were not baptized, must be of opinion that there were no infants in those households; surely a most improbable supposition, necessitating the further opinion that no parents of infant children were converted.

The probability from this argument, it is conceived, is undeniably in favour of Infant Baptism having been an Apostolic practice.

(b) In the Epistles parents are directed to "train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Children are also themselves addressed and exhorted as already in Christ—elect, saints—and are urged to act on Christian motives, "Obey your parents

in the Lord, for this is right." When then we find no directions given regarding their future baptism, when we find the Apostles addressing them as disciples and members of the Christian Church, when we know that Christ commanded his Apostles "to make disciples *of all nations, baptizing them," &c. Is it not much more probable than not that the children addressed as disciples had been baptized? Thus here also the probability is decidedly in favour of Infant Baptism having been an Apostolical practice.

(c) We know from Scripture that the Apostles were accustomed to the reception of infants into the Jewish Church by Circumcision; there is also satisfactory evidence in Jewish writers to show that they were in the habit of baptizing the infants of proselytes. Children were, moreover, frequently involved in the punishment of parents on the one hand (Num. xvi. 27—32, Joshua vii. 24, Exodus xx. 5)—and in the blessing of parents on the other (Genesis xxii. 16-17, Exodus xx. 5,). Children and slaves, according to Jewish manner of thought and Eastern customs, shared in the duties or blessings of parents and masters. (Gen. xvii. 23.) Now bearing in mind the fact that the Apostles were accustomed to Jewish rites and deeply attached to them, which is more probable—that the Apostles, according to the analogy of Jewish custom, would admit the infants of Christian parents to the Christian Church by baptism, or that, contrary to Jewish usage, they would leave infants unbaptized, unnumbered among Christ's disciples? Were they likely to believe that our God and Father, Who willed that under the older and narrower Dispensation infants should be circumcised, and doubtless obtain some blessing thereby, yet willed not in the new and more Catholic Dispensation that infants should be baptized and made partakers of blessings in connection with that sacrament? Clearly the probability here also is that the Apostles sanctioned Infant Baptism.

(d). In John iii. 5, our Lord speaks of *a birth of water* as necessary for entrance into the kingdom of God. The phrase "born of water" is most naturally understood of baptism; and whilst very few, and that in comparatively recent times, have explained it otherwise, yet the vast majority of expounders of Scripture from the earliest ages, have understood it as referring to baptism. We are more likely to be safe in thinking with such, than in endeavouring to find out some original explanation ourselves. Upon these grounds we are justified in understanding these words of † baptism; then the question arises, are we to take them as referring to the baptism of adults only, or as teaching the necessity of baptizing infants also? How, as Christ did not say that infants needed not this birth of water, can any of us presume to limit His words to adults? Must it not be at least safer to take His words in a general than in a limited sense here? If we take them in a limited sense, as excluding infants, may we not lose for them somewhat of the blessing for which Christ said birth of water was needed?

(e). It is an undeniable fact that Infant Baptism has been all but universally practised throughout Christendom for eighteen centuries; that being the case, it is more probable that such practice was a following of Apostolical custom, than that it was first adopted in years subsequent to their times.

(f). To sum up what has been said, if the probability in several or all of the above arguments is in favour of Infant Baptism having been an Apostolical practice; taking all these probabilities together, there is an exceedingly high degree of probability, in fact, a moral certainty, that Infant Baptism was an Apstoolical practice, that it is not to be considered a mere human ordinance, and that it cannot be safely neglected or discarded.

(g). If, notwithstanding what has been said, some are still perplexed and shaken in mind by hearing Infant Baptism frequently spoken of as a custom to be condemned, or regarded with indifference, such will do well to consider whether the opinions of a few men of influence, good moral character, and fair judgment in things of this world, are likely to be more correct, sound, and worthy of weight than the opinions of all the great theologians and godly divines of our Church in every age. All may, for the above-mentioned reasons, rest satisfied that Infant Baptism was practised by the Apostles, and therefore approved of by the Spirit of Christ which guided them.

PART II.

Being satisfied now, on good grounds, that Infant Baptism is an Apostolical practice, we must of course believe that when the Apostles spoke or wrote of the baptized, they meant in general *all the baptized—infants as well as adults*. It would be clearly presumptuous in us, without very strong reason, to limit the application of their words to a portion of the baptized, *i.e.*, adults, and to exclude little ones. Bearing in mind this self-evident principle, let us call to mind a few passages of Scripture. In 1 Cor., xii. 13, St. Paul says, "By one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, and were made to drink into one Spirit." As has just been observed, we must understand him as speaking of all* the baptized, infants as well as adults, and that it is conceived cannot mean less than that the Spirit of God was instrumental in causing us and ours to be baptized; and the words "we have been made to drink into one Spirit," clearly intimate that all the baptized in general have received a portion or measure of the gift of the Holy Ghost. Other passages, with equal force, teach this also, as where Christians in general are addressed as "temples of the Holy Ghost" by the indwelling Spirit, not, however, thereby meaning that Christians are necessarily safe or secure from falling, for, at the same time, they are addressed as liable to become members of an harlot and to be destroyed (1 Cor. vi. 15).

Thus the Scriptures in general speak of all the baptized as possessors of a measure of the Holy Spirit and baptized by Him. It is also fit to remark that when baptism is spoken of in the Epistles, we should believe the Apostles meant, and their original readers

* It should always be observed that the original of the word "teach," Matt. xxviii. 19, is quite different from that translated "teaching" in verse 20; the former meaning "make disciples of." Dean Alford says: "In our Lord's words the process of ordinary discipleship is *from baptism to instruction;* i.e., is *admission in infancy to the covenant* and *growing up* to observe all things whatsoever our Lord commanded, the *exception* being, what circumstances rendered so frequent in the Early Church, *instruction before baptism*, in the case of adults."

† "There can be no doubt on any hor est interpretation of the words, that γεννηθηναι εξ υδατος refers to the token or outward sign of baptism, γ. εκ πνευματος to the thing signified or inward grace of the Holy Spirit. All attempts to get rid of *these two plain facts* have sprung from doctrinal prejudices, by which the views of expositors have been warped . . . All the better and deeper expositors have recognized the co-existence of the two, *water* and the *Spirit*."—Alford.

* This was also according to the manner in which he had written of children of Israel, "all" of whom, including women and children, he had just spoken of as "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

understood, baptism such as our Lord commanded on the most solemn occasion alluded to in Matt. xxviii. 19. To suppose the Apostles meant a different baptism from that which their Great Master bade them administer, would be, it is conceived, to suppose that they were deficient in reverence and respect for Him. By baptism they must have meant baptism administered according to His directions, one of the things to be observed "according to what He had commanded." Upon this principle we must understand, Gal. iii. 27, "As many of you* as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." All the baptized, infants and adults, had put on Christ. So also when the Apostle writes to all the baptized as "buried with Christ in baptism," Col. ii. 12, Rom. vi. 4, we must understand him as speaking of infants as well as adults, and of baptism such as Christ commanded. Thoughtful readers of Scripture will scarcely take upon themselves to assert that those of whom Christ said "of such are the kingdom of heaven," whom He exhorted us all to resemble, and to whom He testified His good will, are excluded from the blessings spoken of in such passages.

If, then, amid the diverse opinions about baptism which spread among some, we calmly seek for Scriptural views, if in doubtful points we desire to be guided by he learned and godly of old, we cannot, I think, avoid concluding that Infant Baptism is most agreeable with the Institution of Christ, and that all the baptized, infants as well as adults, are in Scripture spoken of as possessors of blessings of which the unbaptized are not possessors, and that one of those blessings consists in a real measure of the gift of the Holy Ghost. It seems clear also that those who speak of the baptized as not possessing such blessing speak differently from the Apostles.

We may remark also, that that Church speaks most Apostolically and scripturally which seeks neither to discard nor exaggerate the use of language such as is found in Scripture in connection with this subject. Let us not then be ashamed of the language of our Church, nor think it expresses more than the Apostles expressed on this subject.

But while our Church does speak of real and great gifts connected with baptizm, that does not mean that the baptized cannot perish, even as St. Paul's language about the baptized did not mean that they might not be destroyed (1 Cor. iii. 17) or be castaways (1 Cor. ix.27). Neither does the language of our Church mean that the baptized need not pray for pardon, more grace, love to Christ and men. Even as St. Paul taught the baptized to pray for mercy, and grace, and love, and every good gift (1 Tim. i. 2, Heb. iv. 16, Philip. i. 9, and Colos. i. 9); neither does the language of our Church mean that the baptized need not watch that they might be ready for the Master's coming, and take heed lest they fall, and keep under the body lest they be castaways, and labour that they may be accepted of Christ, even as St. Paul taught the baptized to do (1 Cor. x. 6-12, ix. 27, 2 Cor. v. 9).

* Luther, on this passage, (see Alford) says: "This place is much to be observed against fanatical spirits, who lower the dignity of baptism and speak blasphemously and impiously concerning it. Paul, on the contrary, adorns it with glorious titles, calling it the laver of regeneration and of the renewing of the Holy Ghost; and here, he says, all persons baptized into Christ have put on Christ, as though he would say, ye received not by baptism a sign, by which you were enlisted into the number of Christians, as many fanatics of our day think. But, because 'as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ,' ye have been snatched from the Law into a new nativity which was effected in baptism."

Further supplies of grace should be daily sought for ourselves and our little ones; watchful, prayerful dispositions should be cultivated. A more entire putting off the old man, and putting on the new man is to be laboured after, if we really desire a portion amongst Christ's faithful followers hereafter. May we then have grace to think neither too lightly of baptism on the one hand, nor too highly on the other, "ever reaching forward unto those things which are before, pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Philip. iii. 13-14).

CORRESPONDENCE.

CIRCUMCISION.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—It is difficult to understand what "C. P. R." means when he speaks of the "religious necessity of Circumcision" being advocated by your correspondents. Who on earth ever supposed that the religious necessity ever could be, not only not advocated, but even thought of? It is simply an exaggeration to say so, for the purpose apparently of throwing ridicule on those who think that it may possibly be a great preservation of purity; and that it is so I know to be a fact, on the authority of eminent medical men.

G. T.

:o:

THE BURIALS BILL.

SIR,—As the Burials Bill has been remodelled in the House of Commons, it authorizes burials with any Christian service or without a service in any churchyard or public burial-ground where the deceased person would have otherwise had a right to be buried. It is no longer limited to cases where there is no other public burial-ground available. The only reasonable ground for this extension of the Bill is a desire to enable persons to be buried near their ancestors or relations. But if this be intended, it is singular that the Bill should be altogether limited by Section 10 to burial-grounds where the deceased person has a right to be buried. If the deceased person should be residing in an adjoining parish to that to which the churchyard or burial-ground belongs, there would usually be no difficulty in obtaining permission from the proper authorities for the deceased person to be buried there; but as the Bill no longer applies, such a burial must be accompanied by the Church of England service, which no one will be able to dispense with. This might be remedied by a clause enabling the same authority which can allow any persons to be buried in a churchyard or other consecrated burial-ground also to allow this to be done with any Christian service. Such a provision would not be open to the chief objection to the Bill—viz., the risk of annoyance to the clergy and to Churchmen. Also it would remove a difficulty which would otherwise attend the working of the Bill—viz., that if the lawfulness of the burial with another service depends upon the right to be buried in the churchyard, the clergyman must ascertain that the right is well founded before allowing it to be performed.

1, New-square, Lincoln's-Inn, H. R. DROOP.

TESTIMONIAL TO THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

SIR,—May I call the attention of your readers to an advertisement in your columns on this subject, and at the same time make an explanation to persons who may be somewhat puzzled by an appeal also under the above heading by the Precentor of Lincoln?

Immediately on reading Mr. Peel's letter in the *Guardian* suggesting donations to the Southwell Bishopric Fund, as a substantial acknowledgment of the thanks of those who had signed the address to our Bishop, I wrote to the Bishop of Nottingham and expressed my willingness to receive such donations. Meantime, the worthy Precentor had seized the opportunity for soliciting help for the Hostel, an excellent object of charity, but hardly so needful to the Church at large, I should suppose, as the new bishopric, which, when established, will, we hope, afford relief to our beloved Diocesan, and save his valuable life from being undermined by over-work.

It thus happens that there appears before the world a double appeal for one object; and every one must for himself decide whether to support the bishopric fund, so earnestly helped as it has been by the framer of the address—the Bishop of Nottingham—or whether he will assist in the useful but less important scheme of providing furniture for, and repairing and altering, the building which the Bishop of Lincoln has so nobly given for the training of students for the ministry.

I may also state that the Bishop of Lincoln, quite independently of the testimonial fund, has requested and authorised me to receive donations for the Southwell Bishopric Fund in this county, and I shall also be glad to receive assistance for another fund for providing an Episcopal residence at Southwell. Ladies are particularly requested to take this latter fund into their favour, and to let it be their gift to the new diocese.

I may, perhaps, explain that "the testimonial fund" will be a separate account, and presented, as a whole, to the Bishop of Lincoln himself, to be by him given to the endowment fund.

The endowment fund itself, as well as the residence fund, will also each be separate accounts, and added to the funds being raised in the county of Nottingham and diocese of Lichfield for the same objects.

CHAS. W. MARKHAM, Hon. Sec. and Treasurer for Southwell Bishopric Fund in Lincolnshire.

Saxby Rectory, Barton-on-Humber, Sept. 4, 1880.

The second memorial to the Bishop of Lincoln, containing over one thousand three hundred and sixty signatures, will be presented this week to his lordship. A few words descriptive of its appearance may be of interest to its subscribers, and to others, among our readers. The names are written on long sheets of fine toned paper, each containing fifty, and the designations in the same line, at equal intervals. There are twenty-seven sheets now ready, of which twenty, containing a thousand names, are already attached to the address. These names and designations, as well as the address itself, are beautifully engrossed, and the roll presents a very artistic appearance to the eye. The entire roll is of great length, exceeding twice that of the first address from the Diocese of Lincoln. The document reminds its beholder of some ancient parchment-roll containing an almost endless genealogy, such as those given in St. Matthew i. and St. Luke iii. A simple calculation would show that the number of signatures attached to the two rolls amount to exactly tenfold the number of generations since the creation of Adam down to the present day, allowing an average of thirty years to each. The roll is finished with purple silk, with corresponding margin, and will be highly gratifying to the Bishop of Lincoln. We will furnish our readers next week with his lordship's reply.

—— : o : ——

The Bishop of London has left town for the Continent for a few weeks. He requests that all letters on business may be sent to his Secretary, Mr. J. B. Lee, 2, Broad Sanctuary, Westminster.

The Rev. Charles Johnson Taylor, of St. John's College, Oxford, who has been vicar of Holy Trinity, Folkestone, since 1868, removes to the Crown living of Topplesfield, near Halstead, in Essex, and the Rev. Robert Hall Baynes, of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, Hon. Canon of Worcester and Rector of Topplesfield, becomes the new vicar of Holy Trinity.

The Rev. Arthur Rigg, who died last week in Warrington-crescent, Maida-hill, in the sixty-ninth year of his age, was well known in the northern dioceses, from the fact of having held for thirty years the post of Principal of the Diocesan Training College at Chester. He was born in the year 1811, and was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1835.

The Bishop of St. David's has left for the Continent, and does not return until immediately before his Visitation, commencing October 13th. The clergy of the diocese are requested to write to their respective Archdeacons (or, on formal business, to the Bishop's Secretary) concerning any urgent matters which may arise during his absence; and to defer to the completion of the Visitation any communications which will admit of such delay.

After each of his Visitation addresses the Archbishop of Canterbury entertains at luncheon the clergy, churchwardens, and sidesmen who have obeyed his summons. At Tunbridge, in responding to the toast of his health, the most rev. prelate said he could not boast that he never had any difference of opinion with his clergy; but then he remembered the anecdote of Archdeacon Paley. Bishop Barrington once said to him, "Let me introduce you to Mrs. Barrington. We have lived together for fifty years, and we have never had a single word of difference upon any subject whatever." Paley replied, "Mighty dull!" (Laughter.) Nor could he (the Archbishop) repeat the words of a distinguished French prelate who once remarked, "When I say to my clergy, 'March!' they march; and when I say 'Halt!' they halt." That certainly was not his (the most rev. prelate's) experience; and he did not think that, living as we did in a free country, any one had a right to say to any one else "March!" or "Halt!" Everybody was entitled to think for himself, and great results were thus arrived at both in Church and in State. People said we lived in very bad times; but after all he would ask in what other times or in what other country would persons who used that language have preferred to have had their lot cast? For himself he was tolerably well satisfied as things were, and he did not see why we should take a desponding view. He had ever received the greatest possible kindness in many times of trial from the clergy and laity of Canterbury, and he hoped they might enjoy every blessing which the Almighty could bestow upon them.

The *Liverpool Chronicle* understands that there is a considerable number of candidates for the primary ordination of the Bishop of Liverpool on the 19th inst.; but that there being no Advent ordination (a very unusual circumstance) is likely to cause considerable inconvenience to deacons and their incumbents. In one or two cases University graduates are likely to be lost to the diocese unless his lordship grants letters dimissory.

The projected Ecclesiastical Art Exhibition, of which a good deal was heard in the early part of the year, has been abandoned for the present, the main reason assigned by its promoters for the non-fulfilment of their scheme being their inability to obtain permission from the Board of Works to erect the necessary buildings upon the Thames Embankment. In the meantime arrangements are in progress for holding the usual Art Exhibition during the session of the Church Congress.—*Literary Churchman.*

At the following Oxford Diocesan Conference Professor Burrows will move—"That the progress of the temperance movement has been seriously hindered by (1) the fanaticism of certain total abstainers; (2) the advocacy of severe methods of legal repression; and (3 by occasional indiscreet political action on the part of the advocates of temperance." An amendment will be moved by Canon Ellison:—"That the progress of the temperance movement, both in the Church and the country at large, has been such as to exceed the expectations even of its warmest promoters; and that nothing would be so likely to endanger its further progress as uncalled-for reflections proceeding from a diocesan conference on the language which may have been occasionally used by some 'terribly in earnest' speakers, or on the exercise by temperance reformers of their undoubted political rights."

For many months the parish church of Thirsk, which has been recently restored, has been infested with some scores of bats, which not only made fearful work of the oak stalling, but at evening service might be seen flitting to and fro in the vicinity of the rafters of the nave roof. For a length of time they have been a source of great trouble to the church officials and the vicar, and various means have been conceived to rid the edifice of the pests. The church has been stoved with cayenne, but with no beneficial effect, and during the present week an owl has been placed in the church, and during the past few nights the officials have paid regular visits to St. Mary's for the purpose of ascertaining what effect the new inhabitant had on them, but although they have waited each evening well into the darkening not a bat has been seen, where but a few days ago some scores were even visible. If the owl has not destroyed them he has had the effect of compelling them to keep very close quarters. A few months ago the bats did damage to the trombone pipes of the new organ. They entered at the wide end, and, the pipes being narrow at the bottom, found themselves unable to get back. As many as seven or eight dead bats were found in a single pipe.—*Sheffield Independent.*

The Bishop of Liverpool at the end of July wrote to the Rev. J. Bell Cox, incumbent of St. Margaret's, Prince's-park, asking him to call upon him. On his doing so, the Bishop drew Mr. Cox's attention to a paragraph in a local paper describing an evening service at the dedication festival, and asked him as a friend to give up four points—lighted candles, the use of a cope, incense, and the biretta. Mr. Cox said that he should like to consult his congregation, as the things objected to had been in use nearly eleven years, and had been all presented by the people. The Bishop assented to this, and thought that, should the matter be put before them, the congregation would be willing to meet his views; but added, "I trust you will not forget that no wish of your congregation can exonerate you from responsibility for anything that happens in your church. I say this as your friend and Bishop." Mr. Cox consulted his churchwardens and sidesmen, and the result was a letter to the Bishop, declining to reconcile the congregation to any change, especially as they had not been interferred with during the late Episcopate. He concluded by saying that if any reasons could be assigned for the change at this moment in the interest of the diocese, and if some security was given that his lordship would protect them against further change or prosecution, he could approach them with something definite. The Bishop, writing a few days ago, says:—"You inform me that you have brought the matters to which I called your attention before your churchwardens and sidesmen. Let me as a friend remind you once more that the question I want you to consider is not what your congregation like, or has been accustomed to, but what is legal. In this you are to guide congregation, and the congregation is not to guide you." The *Liverpool Mercury* says:—"The church of St. Margaret's, Prince's-park, was originally built for a well-known clergyman in the west of England of moderate High Church opinions and Liberal principles, who refused to take it. Mr. Parnell was then appointed, and, being soon after involved in a lingering lawsuit in the ecclesiastical courts on account of his ritualistic practices, resigned rather than submit. The patron then appointed the Rev. J. Bell Cox, the present incumbent, the son of a well-known literary clergyman in London, said to be one of the most entertaining of companions at those somewhat dull banquets in which City magnates delight. The Bishop of Chester has more than once since his incumbency been moved to again interfere, but has declined, partly, we believe, from a dislike to anything in the shape of persecution, and the difficulties of the ecclesiastical law, but also because there is no parish attached to the church, and because it is the only place of worship in this large city where, in any practical manner, anything approaching excessive ritualism is known. Mr. Bell Cox has rather gone out of his way to be respectful to the Bishop of Liverpool. He spoke in an Advent sermon of his satisfaction at his appointment. He dined at the Church Club at the dinner in his honour, and in other ways has shown himself anything but an irreconcilable priest. Dr. Ryle, however, objects to ritual on principle, and at present Mr. Cox shows no disposition to comply with what he no doubt regards as the excessive demands of his Diocesan. The result, therefore, it is feared, will be the institution of proceedings—a course which must be painful to everybody concerned, and which cannot but lead to prolonged strife and controversy in the new diocese. It is said that the Bishop objects not only to vestments and other things which have been ruled unlawful, but to processions; while, if we are well informed, he has not spoken of what really does distress many worshippers—viz., the *minutiæ* of ritual, such as beginning the Communion Office at one side of the altar and crossing over to the other, reading the Epistle and Gospel with the back to the people, and other wanton revivals of obsolete rites which surely involve no principle. Is it not possible that, on the Bishop refraining from an appeal to the law, Mr. Bell Cox might yield some things not of constraint, but of a willing mind?"

On Wednesday the Rev. Marcus R. Southwell, incumbent of St. Stephen's, St. Albans, suddenly expired, while watching some workmen in a field. He has held the living for over thirty years, and was over eighty years of age.

Presiding at a meeting of the Carlisle Diocesan Church Extension Society at the Ulverston on Monday week, the Bishop of Carlisle deprecated the despondent view taken by many as to the position of the Church of England. He was not surprised that what had taken place with regard to the Burials Bill should have filled many people with gloomy views as to the future of the Church. But there was a brighter side to look at, and he thought it was better to look at that side. It seemed to him that any legislation of the kind he had mentioned would be but as dust in the balance compared with the vast power which the Church of England had if she would only exercise it with unanimity and effect. The true method of defending the Church was in making the parochial system thoroughly efficient, and should the question of the maintenance of the Church ever come to the fore, as probably it would, he doubted whether the people of England would be so exceedingly blind to their own spiritual interests as to accept the proposal to destroy that Church which had been built up with so much pains and so marvellously blessed by Almighty God, and of which he believed an immense majority were exceedingly proud.

The Rev. William John Butler, vicar of Wantage, has been appointed to the canonry of Worcester vacant by the death of the Rev. R. Seymour. Mr. Butler was born about the year 1818, and was a Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his degree in 1840. He was ordained in 1841 by Bishop Summer of Winchester. He was for some years curate of Dogmersfield, Hampshire, and subsequently of Puttenham, Surrey, and held the perpetual curacy of Wareside, Hertfordshire, from 1844 to 1846. He was appointed vicar of Wantage by the Dean and Chapter of Windsor in 1846, diocesan inspector of schools in 1849, Rural Dean of Wantage in 1853, and Honorary Canon of Christ Church in 1872. In 1874 he was elected a Proctor in Convocation for the diocese of Oxford. A correspondent of the *Times* says Mr. Butler is a model parish priest, and has a great hold over working men. In no parish in England, probably, is Ascension Day so well observed as at Wantage, numbers of labourers being in church at six o'clock before their work, the communicants before breakfast sometimes numbering four hundred, He has been the founder of the Wantage Sisterhood, and, though a decided High Churchman, has used his influence to restrain extreme men.

—— : o : ——

BOOKS, &c., RECEIVED.

"Religious Belief." By J. Quarry, D.D. Hodges Foster, and Figgis

"Philosophy of Jesus Christ." By R. Collins. Elliot Stock.

"Macmillan's Magazine." Macmillan & Co.

"The Antiquary" for September. Elliot Stock.

"The Churchman" for September. Elliot Stock.

"Good Words" for September. Isbister & Co.

"Sunday Magazine" for September. Isbister & Co.

———o———

Erratum.—In Dean Bagot's Hymn on "Faith" in our las Number, the 3rd line of the second verse should have been

"Fills the believer's soul with joy"—

and the word "Truth," at the beginning of the third verse, should have been "Faith."

On Wednesday the Rev. George Edward Jelf, M.A., who succeeds the late Dr. Miller as Canon of Rochester, was installed at the cathedral. Mr Jelf was student of Christ Church, Oxford, and took his B.A degree in 1856. He was curate of St. Michael's, Highgate, from 1858 to 1860, and was so subsequently curate of St. James's, Clapton, and St. Mary's, Aylesbury. He was appointed vicar of St. Matthew's, Blackmoor, in the diocese of Winchester, and afterwards vicar of Saffron Walden, Essex.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baynes, Rev. Robert Hall, rector of Topplesfield, Halstead; vicar of Holy Trinity, Folkestone.

Blake, Rev. G. L., chaplain to H.M.S. "Inconstant."

Bolton, Rev. C. N., vicar of All Saints', Darlaston; vicar of Cannock.

Butler, Rev. William John, vicar of Wantage; canon of Worcester.

Clark, Rev. James R., naval instructor to H.M.S. "Inconstant."

Douglas, Rev. T., perpetual curate of Ireleth, Lancashire.

Gunter, Rev. William, chaplain to H.M.S. "Hector."

Hooper, Rev. Richard Hope, vicar of Great Coxwell, Berks; Surrogate.

Humphreys, Rev. Henry James, incumbent of Radyr; rector of Llangan, Glamorganshire.

Layng, Rev. W. W., vicar of Spilsby with Eresby; rural dean of the Deanery of Hill No. I.

Levie, Rev. Alexander, vicar of Nun Ormsby, Lincolnshire.

Lovejoy, Rev. William, vicar of Grayrigg, Kendal; vicar of Edenhall-cum-Langwathley, Cumberland.

Majendie, Rev. Arthur, rector of Bladon-cum-Woodstock, Oxon; Surrogate.

Morris, Rev. George, curate-in-charge of St. Andrew's, Paignton.

Smith, Rev. H. R., vicar of Grange, Lancashire; honorary canon in Carlisle Cathedral.

Taylor, Rev. Charles Johnson, vicar of Holy Trinity, Folkestone; rector of Topplesfield, Halstead.

Thomas, Rev. Henry, perpetual curate of Penydarran, Glamorganshire.

Wilkinson, Rev. John H., late chaplain of Chinsurah-cum-Serampore; rector of Christon.

Williams, Rev. John, curate (sole charge) of Pentyrch-with-Llantwit Vardre, Glamorganshire.

Williams, Rev. Charles L., curate of Aston; association secretary of Church Missionary Society for West Yorkshire.

Williams, Rev. William Henry, curate of Amersham, Bucks rector of Portskewett.

—— : o : ——

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bennett, Rev. Henry Leigh, Thorpe Place, Chertsey, on the 31st ult., aged 85.

Cholmeley, Rev. Robert, D.D., at the Vicarage, Findon, Sussex, for twenty years vicar of Findon, late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and second son of the late Robert Cholmeley, B.D., rector of Wainfleet All Saits', Lincolnshire, on the 30th ult., aged 62.

Gordon, Rev. George Maxwell, M.A., killed in a sortie from Candahar, of the Church Missionary Society, acting chaplain to the Forces, youngest son of the late Captain J. E. Gordon, R.N., M.P., on the 16th ult., aged 41.

Gowring, Rev. J. W., at 155, Stockwell-road, on the 31st ult., aged 69.

Hodgson, Rev. James Thomas, M.A., at Brighton, of Charterhouse, on the 3rd inst., aged 35.

Rigg, Rev. Arthur, M.A., at 71, Warrington-crescent, London, for thirty years principal of the Chester Diocesan Training College, on the 2nd inst., aged 68.

Scholefield, Rev. Richard Browne, at Newton House, Hunstanton, vicar of Appleton, and formerly rector of West Newton, on the 3rd inst., aged 62.

Schneider, Rev. Henry, late rector of Carlton Scroop, Lincoln, for forty-four years, on the 1st inst., aged 80.

Southwell, Rev. Marcus Richard, at the Vicarage, St. Stephen's, St. Albans, for fifty years vicar of St. Stephen's, on the 1st inst., aged 75.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHRISTIAN'S POSSESSION.

By the Rev. CANON DUCKWORTH, D.D.,
Vicar of St. Mark's, Marylebone.

Sermon Preached at Westminster Abbey, on Sunday Afternoon, September 5th, 1880.

"For all things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world; or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and you are Christ's; and Christ is God's."—1 Cor. iii. 21—23.

IN nothing, brethren, is the greatness of St. Paul more conspicuous than in his power of lifting a question right out of all petty and local surroundings into that serene region of heavenly light and verity where the storms of human passion never blow. As he is the model disputant by virtue of his unfailing candour, courage, and charity; so he is the pattern of all arbitrators in spiritual things by his habitual recourse to those grand, guiding principles which are never out of date, and which reduce to their true proportions all the controversies of time. That epistle, through which we are now reading in our morning lessons supplies us with the best-known exercise of this noble habit. An unhappy outbreak of religious faction in the Church at Corinth is the occasion of it, and we see with what tact the Apostle at once deals with the danger and rises above the strife of the passing hour. He appears upon the scene not only to protest against the mischief at work, but to go to the root of it. He makes use of the paltry quarrel, into which, in spite of himself, his name had been dragged, to teach essential and permanent lessons. Once for all, he determines the true relation between teachers and taught within the Church of Christ. The doctrine which he lays down is this—that Christian teachers, with all their diversity of gifts, bestowed upon them for the edification of the body of Christ, really belong to that body. They are a part of the property enjoyed in common by all believers. Why, then, fight over Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas? Why claim to belong to this teacher or to that? The ownership is, in truth, the other way. These teachers all belong to *you*. "Such partialities and preferences," St. Paul would say, "only show that you know not the boundless range of Christian privilege." Paul and Apollos, and Cephas, and all the teachers of whose names you would make watchwords—what are they? They are your possession; they are a part of that great inheritance which you are called through Christ freely to enjoy. Belonging to Christ, you may lay claim to them and to all that they can do for you; all their gifts and all their services are bestowed for your sakes, and are absolutely at your disposal. Paul is yours, to lay, as a wise master-builder, that imperishable foundation other than which no man can lay. Apollos is yours, to build on that foundation, yours to fire you with his eloquence, and to enrich you with his learning; Cephas is yours, with his daring faith, his impetuous devotion, his dearly-bought experience; all that these have, and all that these are, all that in them can minister to your growth in grace, is freely made over to you. Every type of Christian character, every variety of Christian endowment, every shade of Christian sentiment is put at your command." For, indeed, what is not? "Heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ," you have a vested right in these things which can never be done away. Nay, if you belong to Christ, even though to the eye of man you may have nothing, you possess all things.

And first, brethren, let us look at the main lesson of the text, and let us remember with shame that it is one which the Churches of Christendom have not mastered yet. Strange, indeed, it seems to come again and again upon the record of these early factions, and to find in our own religious strifes the very counterpart of what the Apostle denounced. "What," it has been asked, "would St. Paul have thought if he had seen or heard at all of our contentions? For three or four parties then, we have our scores and hundreds of sects now, and instead of being ashamed of our divisions we glory in them. Each sect is faithful to its principles only when it is zealous in proclaiming its differences from other sects. What ought to unite us in spite of all possible differences, divides us in spite of all bonds of union." But not to speak of rival Christian communities, parted by doctrinal barriers, hardly conceivable then—barriers, alas, of which no schemes of conciliation seem to promise a removal—I would ask you to think of our own divisions, and to bring the Apostle's lofty rebuke right home to ourselves. Must we not plead guilty to something which closely corresponds to the fierce and intolerant partisanships of the Corinthian Church? In our own Church of England we see parties and sections and sub-sections differing one from the other, ranged under party leaders, represented by party newspapers, and tending more and more towards actual separation. What, we may well ask ourselves, is the remedy for this state of things? What can each one of us do to keep the "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace"? Surely there is one thought arising out of the Apostle's words which may well arrest and soften us, and it is this—that the great and good whose names are taken as watchwords and war-cries, differed only on minor things, while they agreed upon all that is essential. Look to that which commends us to God, and is there any such radical difference between Paul and Apollos, between Apollos and Cephas, between saints of God so different in many ways, as, for example, Luther

and Pascal, and John Wesley? Set aside the accidents of temporary division and passing controversy, and is there not a wondrous family likeness between holy and humble men of heart in every age? It is God's will, brethren, that the unity of every Church should be made up of diversity, that one aspect after another of Divine truth should be periodically accentuated by a master mind, and commended afresh to the consciences of men. It is by his appointment that now a St. Paul stands forth as a champion of faith, and now a St. James as the champion of works. There are times in the Church's history when the pressing need is that the simplicity of Christ's doctrine should be rescued from corruption; there are times when what she most needs is that her members should be stirred up to display in their lives the fruits of those doctrines, the theory of which they know full well; and God, Who knows how to choose the instruments best fitted for the work He has for them, brings forward and employs in His service men of every type of character according to the exigency of the hour. And thus to correct the error of an exclusive reliance for salvation on outward or ritual observances, or the error of claiming salvation as not of grace, but of debt, He raises up a St. Paul to proclaim in all its fullness the doctrine of justification by the free gift of God; and where the peril is that men should undervalue the lessons of morality, and "turn the grace of God into lasciviousness," He inspires a St. James to bring into relief the necessity of that personal holiness, "without which no man shall see the Lord." But the disastrous mistake, so often repeated, is to regard the teachers of these different types as antagonistic, instead of being what God intends them to be, complementary to each other. The message of a St. Paul is needed to complete that of a St. James; the message of a St. James is the special guard against the perversion of the teaching of St. Paul; and to this Divine value of diversity partisans are always blind. Who, brethren, can estimate what has been lost to us even in our own generation through this blindness? What precious powers have been diverted from the cross of Christ! What energies that might have been gloriously expended on the sin and ignorance in our midst have been wasted before our eyes in the miserable warfare of Church parties! A bias each one of us may have either from temperament or training towards a particular teacher or a particular school; and such preference is a perfectly venial thing, so long as we are careful not to disfigure it by strife and envy. It can do no harm while we are strictly tenacious of charity, both in our thoughts and in the treatment of those who differ from us; but surely the ideal Christian attitude is that of the man who is consciously raising himself above all partisanship, who is learning, at whatever sacrifice of prejudice, not to glory in men—even in the best of men; who is learning to say, "I call no man master upon earth; I am, if you will, of Paul, and of Apollos, and of Cephas—a disciple at heart of each and all who are taught of God, and charged by Him with a message to my soul; for all things are mine since I am Christ's." It is true the Apostle does not explicitly say this, but he implies it; on no other ground except this—that we belong to Christ—can it be said that all things are ours. When the law of the cross is the law of our being; when we surrender ourselves; when we are no longer our own, but consciously and willingly belong to the Lord who has bought us, then, and only then, do do we enter into the command of all things.

Look, then, brethren, at the items of this boundless wealth of which the Apostle has taken inventory. "The world," he says, "is yours." There is, then, a sense in which we may gain the whole world and not lose our souls. Nay, St. Paul would say it is only through care of the soul that the world, in any true sense, can be gained at all. But observe, he is here speaking of the whole framework of creation, the whole handiwork of God; and he declares that this belongs to the Christian. Is there not something infinitely elevating, while almost overpowering in that thought? Here is this little dot in the limitless universe, tenanted by myriads of beings, capable of hopes and fears, of joys and sorrows, each struggling for happiness and clinging to precious life, and groping for a trust that he will not perish with the perishing things around him. "Here am I, with anxieties and ambitions, and griefs and delights, and thoughts that can soar as far as the stars; and yet with petty needs and insignificant troubles utterly contemptible if measured by the vastness of the material universe. Is there any provision for my tiny interests in the working of this stupendous whole, or am I but a thing of nought; whose time passes away like a shadow, little higher, indeed, than the animalcule in the water-pool, which shares the mysteries of the thing called life, which to-day is and to-morrow returns to the dust with millions of its fellows in the drying-up of the little pool which is its world?" "Yes," says the Apostle, "this very world in which you feel your utter insignificance, is yours. These mighty forces, of which you seem to be the mere sport and play, are working together for you. They are under the control of a living, personal will. This reign of law, to which we bow, is not the play of blind power unconscious of your fate. No; it is a carefully-adjusted mechanism, devised by One who has numbered the very hairs of your head; Who seeks to be known as the Father of your spirits, and to draw out all your love and trust towards Him.

And in another sense the world is yours. Not only are its invisible forces and its majestic order over-ruled for you; but all its appliances, all its resources, are yours if you are Christ's. Centre your affections on these things, work for them, live in them apart from Christ, and they truly cease to be yours; they do not belong to you, but you to them. You become the slave of the things which perish in the using, and they crush out of you all

that is generous and divine. It is only a surrender to Christ that can teach any man the true use of this world. It is His spirit which takes the measure of all that it has to offer, and makes it minister to great ends; which finds in its common occasions the opportunities of high spiritual service, and subordinates all its changes and uses to eternal good.

Is not this, brethren, the grand teaching to which we have listened in to-day's Gospel? "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." He who, belonging to Christ, has put on the mind of Christ, and who therefore has the will of God ever before him as the master motive, feels that he has one right, true thing to do: in his home, in his toil, in his recreation, he has the world at his feet. "Seek *ye* first the kingdom of God," says our Lord. Between you, the children of light, and the children of this world there must be a radical difference in the estimate of life. You must put first what they put last; you must set your best affections and expend your best energies on the things which have no attraction for them. Leave the supply of all inferior wants to come in the train of those graces which never can be truly yours till you give them precedence in your hearts over everything you are capable of possessing.

But, again, says the Apostle, "Life is yours," life with its infinite meanings, its unspeakable opportunities. It may well be said that it is a solemn thing, and were not God around us with His grace, a truly awful thing, to live. We are "fearfully and wonderfully made"—fearfully and wonderfully endowed. We have thanked God, most of us to-day, brethren—we are about to thank Him again—for our "creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life." To-day we realise what it is to have received the gift of being—that mysterious gift which He has bestowed without seeking the consent of our will, and which He maintains from day to day without taking counsel with us. Surely there come times—there must come times—when the solemnity of existence presses with almost intolerable weight upon the most careless. If there be no Gospel, if there be no grace to help our infirmities and to bear us up under the burden laid upon us, there is something terrible in this mortal life to which we are called; and we can hardly wonder that the loss of all personal consciousness, of personal thought and will and responsibility should be the heaven pictured in the great religious systems of the heathen world.

Yes, "life is yours." That it is so, is the most momentous truth you know. There is nothing to compare with the sense of individual being, this precarious, inalienable possession, a living personality, a conscious soul. But how the words of the Apostle, rightly understood, transfigure this gift of life! How they tell us not of a dark, tragical fact, but of a glorious and hopeful truth. Life is yours. All it means, all it involves, all the stores of joy and hope which it is treasuring daily, all that must grow out of it throughout eternity, all this is yours. And why? Because every burden, every difficulty has been borne, every danger faced, the whole strain measured, by One Who loves you with an infinite tenderness. Thus life through Him is made over anew to each one as an unspeakable gift, not, indeed, I grant you, free from all its mystery, but robbed of all its fear; so that in a sense unapproachable by others, he who is Christ's can thank God for his creation. "I am come," said our Lord, "that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." What does this mean? Not only that a new principle of life might be imparted to the spirits of men by the union of God through Him, but that in a a new and blessed sense the old life might be theirs—theirs more abundantly than it ever had been, furnished with new motives, cheered with new hopes, dedicated to grander uses, inspired and interpreted by the perfect life of Him whose meat and drink was to do His Father's will.

And, again, "death is yours"—death, the last enemy that shall be destroyed, the most merciless and arbitrary of tyrants, whose awful sway, you know it is so vain to dispute. Death is yours, says the Apostle, despoiled of his terrors, handed over to you, your slave, and not your master; for you belong to Him who has the keys of death and hell, and you share the fruits of His victory over the grave. There is, surely, wondrous consolation in the thought, brethren, that Christ has revolutionised our relations with death, that He hath made us conquerors—more than conquerors—where we were captives and victims before. We go to Him who holds the clue to all the mysteries of being, and we find that He does not acquiesce in the grave as the rightful destiny of men. He comes as the Lord of life, the vanquisher of death. Others came before Him, others pondered over the immemorial fate of man, but none could touch it till He came who was to reverse it. Others called it soft names and bespoke welcome for it as the blessed escape from the vain disquiet of an unintelligible world. But he accepted no weak disguise in which philosophy would veil the last enemy: He denounced him for what he was; He singled him out; He challenged him to do his worst; He broke his bonds in sunder, "because it was not possible that he should be holden of them." Having "led captivity captive," and risen Himself to the power of an endless life He saith to us for whom the victory is won, "Death is yours." "Because I live ye shall live also." Death is yours—timed for you by an infinite love and wisdom; yours to minister to your noblest needs; yours, to usher you out of the lower into the higher life; out of the world of shadows into the world of realities; out of the twilight of conjecture into the noontide of knowledge; out of the weak and halting energies of earth into the untiring activities of the perfect service of heaven. "Life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours." In no strange,

no mystical sense, brethren, believe me, is that assurance true. The man who uttered those words lived, as each one of us may live, in the calm air of that upper sphere to which faith, and faith alone, can transport us. For him old things had passed away, and all things had become new. He saw life and death and all human interests through a new medium, no longer distorted by the bewildering mists of earth, but clearly defined in their true proportions and their actual relations. He viewed all human concerns from the side of the risen Christ and in consciousness of everlasting union with Him. And we wonder not, therefore, at the culmination of His glorious climax, the crown of that soaring scale of privilege which stretches from earth to heaven, from time to eternity—"All things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

Observe, the Apostle's thought, that we belong to Christ, and through Christ to God. Christ has bought us, He has redeemed us from the hand of the enemy in order that we may belong to the enemy no more, but henceforth and for ever to our rightful Lord. He has bought us that He may give us to God. This is the sublimest view of salvation, this is the blessing of blessings, the highest it is possible for man to receive. To become what God created us to be, to cease to be our own, and become His, to be no longer self-made aliens, but to come back to our Father's home, our hearts filled with the long-lost spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, "Not mine own, but Thine, O Lord, Thine to do Thy will, Thine to be dealt with as it pleaseth Thee; Thine that I may neither live to myself nor die to myself, but live and die to Thee alone." That is redemption. "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." Yes, "for all mine are Thine and Thine are mine." What an infinite security these words breathe! Oh! for the power to control our fears and misgivings by them; to fall back upon them in all that threatens our allegiance or disturbs our peace! Oh! for faith to look away from our weak and changeful selves to the unchanging One, Who has made us His own, and from Whose love "Neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature," shall be able to separate us for ever.

Miss Mary Windle, of Stanley-villa, St. Giles's, Oxford, has bequeathed £500 to the National Society. The Rev. H. O Middleton has given a donation of £300 to the same society, in addition to his annual subscription of £300.

The Rev. E. J. Rees, for some years senior curate of the parish church, Oswestry, had accepted the post of senior chaplain-curate to the Bishop of Bedford. His duties will be of a missionary character, such as preaching courses of sermons on Sundays, and week-days, addressing gatherings of men in schoolrooms, preaching out-of-doors, helping disabled clergy, and such-like, under the Bishop's direction. The Bishop hopes to have two chaplain-curates engaged in such works.

PHARISAISM.

By the Rev. C. H. O. DANIEL, M.A., Fellow, Bursar, and Chaplain of Worcester College, Oxford.

Sermon Preached Before the University of Oxford.

"Then drew near unto Him all the publicans and sinners for to hear Him. And the Pharisees and Scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them."—Luke xv. 1–2.

THE crowds which gathered about our Lord in the course of His mission were eminently representative of the various phases of Jewish life and thought. They consisted of men drawn from all ranks and classes of society. The ordinary religious teacher appeals more or less distinctly to some one class, to some one type of mind, attempts to satisfy pre-eminently some one craving of the heart or intellect. His teaching is as a rule of an exclusive character, its premisses have a sharp logical definiteness, and it sums up with a "Come out from among them, and be ye separate." But it is the exact opposite in the case of Christ's wandering mission. He lives with all, He is at home in all places, and under all circumstances. Women and children and stained outcasts are at the least equally among His intimates with social magnates and learned men. There is no discriminating Shibboleth to sift the miscellaneous gathering. No eclectic followers are permitted to check free access to the Master. There is no "fencing of the tables" at which He sits, no rebuff for ignorance, no rejection of humility and wretchedness. The net is cast abroad, and its sweep is undiscriminating and universal.

St. Luke, upon the occasion of which my text speaks, selects certain elements from among this miscellaneous audience, and in doing so may be held to strike the key-note of the teaching contained in the several succeeding chapters. He places before us representatives of the two extremes of life and moral conduct and position in the religious and in the social world—the publicans and the sinners are there in the submissive attitude of learners, the Pharisees and the Scribes in the hostile attitude of critics and gainsayers. Respectability, orthodoxy, and tradition take their high exclusive ground, and shut the door in the face of the despised publican and the outcast sinner. Our Lord in rebuking them sets forth the universality of His mission, the catholicity of His Church—a hard doctrine for the favoured and selected sons of Abraham, but a lesson perhaps not less hard, though less obviously counter to their tenets, for religionists of all times and places.

If these crowds which gathered about our Lord were in the first place an epitome of Jewish society, its divisions and its prejudices, they were equally at another remove a compendium and summary of the world at large; you may find in them the salient features of our modern life. Put on one side the

accidental circumstances, the local modifications, and the Herodian, the Publican, the Essene, are types of men as universally applicable as are the Pharisee, the Sadducee, and the sinner. And if the divine element, the kingdom of heaven, was, then a Christ of flesh and blood, mixing familiarly with his fellow-men, it is still the same divine Word, the same Spirit of God, which though now invisible, is the source of all good, inspires all faith, effects from day to day its revolutionary end, putting down the mighty from their seat, and exalting the humble and meek. But then as now this invisible power issued in very different results. It compelled the lively conscience of the sinner, and gathered in the proletariat of the highways and the hedges. But it was repugnant to the Scribe cased in his armour of tradition, to the Sadducee disabled by scepticism, paralysed by rationalism. It was antagonistic to the dogmatism, the self-conceit, the hypocrisy of the Pharisee, it was without attraction for the political religionist, the Herodian. For the kingdom it advanced, and the privileges it conferred, were not of this world. Of all these types, that of the Pharisee is in its way perhaps the most marked, and the characteristics of it have acquired most popular recognition. The names of other Jewish sects, when we use them, we use with a sense of metaphor. But this name, and still more the adjective its derivative, may be said to have been naturalised among us. We may recognise several distinct ideas associated with it. One is that of exclusiveness or spiritual pride. Another is that of formalism, or an exaggerated importance attached to ceremonial life and mechanical observances as compared with the free, untrammelled life which is the outcome of a man's genuine nature. A third is that of hypocrisy, the acting of a part, the duplicity of an external and of an inner life, the former serving as a mask to the latter, imposing upon others or it may be upon ourselves. For most hypocrisy we may observe is of a thoroughly unconscious character. Indeed, it may be questioned whether any except a very few men are absolutely at one with themselves from the core to the surface, and those exceptions are as a rule the men with whom the world finds it impossible to deal, with whom it quarrels as impracticable. But the most part of us if we would be at the pains of analysis would find that whether we are aware of it or not, the conditions of social life have imposed upon us the penalty of a more or less complete duplicity — a duplicity that runs through our thoughts as well as our acts. With the man who takes life easily this is not felt because he is not self-conscious. He is borne on by the current of social life. He is not aware that the external life imposed upon him by circumstances, in which he acquiesces with contentedness, is not the life of his own unbiassed tendencies; nor again is he reflective enough to feel that the creed which he professes in all honesty is one from which the natural movement of his mind would if he gave free play to it to fly off at innumerable points. He accepts the position in which he finds himself placed and is content with the Providence to which he ascribes it. Circumstances do not occur of sufficient power to wake him to consciousness, and to revolt. But those with whom introspection is a more or less constant habit live in a continual uneasy sense of this duplicity of their lives. The citizen cannot help recognising the price he pays for the advantages of the social state in the freedom he foregoes. The member of a church is forced to recognise how much he sacrifices of himself, of his better nature, and of his perception of truth, or what seems to him truth—for the benefits of communion, of association in religious life, with his co-religionists. This painful consciousness is to those who are possessed by it a perpetual fret. They are for ever chafing at the sense of this irony in their lives. It presents itself to them as a dishonesty which taints all their acts and words. It incites to outbreaks of revolt against the constitution of things, against the servitude which galls them. The generous unpracticalness of youth is often the expression of this feeling. It is not till experience has dulled the sensitiveness of the conscience, till the complications of life have completely cast their meshes round him, that such a man settles down into the easy complacency of conformity, and discovers that he has in him neither the strength nor singleness of will to set prescription and the bondage of the world at defiance. He acquires peace at last in acquiescence, and when he prostrates himself in the House of Rimmon it is with the easy mind of one who has learnt that perpetual self-assertion is a futile revolt against necessary obligations, such as would render sterile all his life by isolating it, and that conformity is the sacrifice of individual reality to the general good.

I do not say that this is the ideal state, or that it is that which would be most desirable for the individual taken by himself. I am but pointing out that this is the condition of those who, while they have acquired a consciouness of this divorce between their outer and their inner lives, shrink—and shrink, as I think, justifiably—from a forfeiture of their share in the community of social and religious life which would entail the paralysis of an isolated existence.

I need not dwell here upon the more obvious form of conscious hypocrisy, when a semblance of religion is intentionally assumed as a cloke to sin. They who lay burdens on others they will not lift themselves; they who prevert the law into an instrument of oppression; they who seek to save their souls in compounding for gross sins by trivial proprieties, such may be dismissed with the denunciation, all the more terrible on those gracious lips, "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites."

Another note or characteristic of the Pharisaic type is formalism. Formalism may be explained as an exaggerated stress laid upon ceremonial,

upon formularies, and upon ordinances, as the elevation in short of the mechanism of life in comparison with the life itself. It is not to be supposed that all or indeed the greater part of those in whom this tendency exists are making an ostentatious display of righteousness, or are assuming a disguise to cloke their hidden propensities, nor yet that they are themselves conscious of the unsubstantial nature of the manifestations of their religious life. The dog, to use a homely illustration, that dropped the bone to grasp its shadow was in downright earnest. Nay, there are but few, I suppose, who do not at times succumb out of sheer weariness to the temptation to rest content with seeming instead of being, to substitute a mechanical goodness for genuineness of life, a conventional orthodoxy for the unquiet pursuit of reality. But there are many whose formalism is of a more radical character. The Pharisaism of such as these seems to be the product of a mental incapacity—of an inability to undergo a spiritual education, such as might raise their minds into a freer air, into a wider sphere of knowledge. The washings of cups, the breadth of a fringe, the countless minute obligations of the Mosaic code formed for the Jew an overgrowth that perpetually threatened to stifle in his nature the spirit and true essence of the religious life. Even as at this day the fashion of a vestment, the ordering of a church, the symbol of a sacrament, are objects to innumerable minds of genuine religious interest. This is not altogether the consequence of the individual organisation. It is true that this puerility may be found often persistent even in those who are brought into contact with the great problems of life, and who one might have supposed would by the very stress of the battle have been driven to take their stand upon realities. But circumstances often favour its development. There is a petty and stagnant life, the backwater, so to say, of the enlarged activities and sympathies of the world (a kind of village existence), in which, from the absence of all scale, unessential things assume a factitious importance, and the activity for want of a nobler outlet finds a vent in trifles. That there is a compatibility of genuine piety and the most narrow formalism, is a fact which meets us at every turn. The history of our own Church bears witness to it in innumerable scars and rents. There is a class of minds to whom the accidents of religion are religion, to whom the external features of the Church militant are of its essence, who have an honest dread that their faith, their spiritual life, may suffer shipwreck in the disappearance of dogma or ceremony beneath the ebbing and flowing tide, whose fluctuations after all are necessary to life and health. There would seem in such cases to be a continuation of the childish stage, in which the imperfect mental development, the preponderance of the imagination over the reason, necessitates external mechanism, and the clothing of the infinite in narrow visible forms. It is true that so long as our knowledge is but fragmentary and obscure, so long as we grope purblind among the shadows and half-lights, so long must forms and traditional observances serve as dykes to control, and channels to guide the devotional life. But in proportion as knowledge becomes complete, as darkness melts into light, in such proportion are the means and outward expressions of life lost sight of, swallowed up in the complete freedom of life itself. This was the lesson of St. Paul to the judaizers of Galatia. It is not the sacrament, he says, it is not circumcision which availeth aught, it is faith, not the form, but the essence; not the letter that killeth, but the spirit that giveth life—life and liberty—unity of life beneath the multiplicity of forms. And in the recognition of this lies the Christian brotherhood, the veritable communion of saints. If we learn to recognise that this communion is not bounded by the limits of a sect, nor by outward forms, not by articles of belief, nor by modes of government—but that it is a unity underlying the fragments of Christendom, the quarrels of its Churches, the dissonance of its creeds, we shall have learnt the hardest of lessons, we shall have been purged of the leaven of the Pharisees, we shall have been made meet to sit down with Christ in the company of publicans and sinners.

I have attempted to illustrate the view that while there is a mode of Pharisaism associated with the most genuine if narrow piety, there is another sense in which we are all—or at least with some rare exceptions—Pharisees, upon whom a duplicity of life is imposed as a general condition of social and religious unity. The practical lesson should be in the former case an enlargement of sympathy—not offending against charity, like Michal, David's wife, by mocking at manifestations of religious fervour, foreign to ourselves and to our needs—in the other case we shall bear in mind that there is an innocent hypocrisy, the condition of that conformity which is necessary to social and religious life, and at which, as each one of us is in one degree or another compelled to practise it, no one is at liberty to cast the first stone. Nor is it altogether disagreeable to ourselves when we come upon traces of this incongruity of the inner and the outer man in others; it is, in fact, a justification in a degree of the duplicity of which we are conscious in ourselves, while the stern aspect of the tragedy of life is in some sense relieved and softened by the vein of humour that thus runs through it.

Thirdly—as to the exclusiveness of the Pharisee. If there is one great practical lesson, before all others running through the teaching of Christ and imparting a principle of radical change into the scheme of life, it is summed in these words, "The last shall be first, and the first last." This doctrine is the first step in the organization, so to say, of the kingdom of Heaven. This is the first in order of all those parodoxes which constitute the sum of Christianity. It was this which in the first centuries of its spread was such an outrage upon

society at large, such an enigma to the dispassionate observer, and yet in this, as Gibbon has justly observed, was one great element of its triumph. The outcast was no longer an outcast. The despised and rejected of men had become the very pattern of the noblest life. Fraternity and equality were realised for the proletariat in their admission to the brotherhood of Christ. And herein lay the essential antagonism to the spirit which possessed the Pharisee. Exclusion was his ideal. He clung to it as his heaven-conferred heritage. Christ broke down the walls of partition. St. Paul, that once Pharisee of the Pharisees, of the straitest sect, prof fessed that he knew not the bounds of the love o- Christ. The kingdom of heaven came not to a favoured few, nor to the elect or the predestinate, but to all. St. Peter, the Jew of Jews, was taught, and in spite of moral feebleness, was forced to witness that God is no respecter of persons. Nay it was to the sick the Physician had come to minister, not to the sound, not to those who professed themselves sound. "I came not to call the righteous," He says in irony, "but sinners to repentance." The privilege of the publican and the sinner shall be awarded also to you if you will step from your pedestal, and clothe yourself with humility. Meanwhile the greater rescue, the more hopeless the outcast, the greater the triumph of the kingdom of heaven. See the one wandering sheep reclaimed, see the one piece of silver lost and found again. See the prodigal son restored with rejoicing to his father's home. Nay, to drop the irony of supposing that there are just men who need no repentance, that there are any sheep who stray not, that there is any son who hath not played the prodigal, see how Lazarus, the outcast, rests in the bosom of the father of the faithful, while Dives, the man of purple and of privileges, and of descent, is tormented.

No doubt to the Pharisees of the Gospel history the combination of hereditary claim with religious pretensions rendered this levelling doctrine inconceivably hard and unpalatable. They, the children of Abraham, the strict disciples of Moses, engrossed the covenanted mercies of God. Well for the rest could they but creep under the skirts of orthodoxy, slink by a postern gate unobserved into the Temple. If the young man, called upon to renounce his riches, went away sorrowful, still more would the Pharisee resent the confiscation of his heritage, by how much it was more precious, and its possession more invidious. But to us, the outcome of nineteen centuries of this teaching, is spiritual pride, and the exclusive temper a thing unknown? Which church, which sect of Christendom does not say for itself "God, I thank Thee that I am not as others are?" What infinite expenditure of theologian's zeal and learning has been lavished, not in levelling with the ground the fortifications which encompassed and strangled their Jerusalem, the anachronisms left by outworn struggles, but in propping the tottering walls, and in drawing ever fresh lines of isolation and exclusion. So, again, for the individual Christian to take the outcast sinner by the hand of equality, and not of patronage, is strange enough to be the subject of a story. But descend in the social scale, and you shall find this essential Christian grace in increasing frequency. The sinners and the outcasts have still the first place in the Kingdom of their Lord. Ye may say in your assembly to the man with the gay clothing, "Sit thou here in a good place, and to the poor, stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool. But. . . hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him?"

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1880.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

AS the day for the twentieth gathering of this Congress is approaching, it is worth while to consider whether by a different arrangement a greater interchange of thought and views on the very important subjects to be discussed might not be secured. We hear that this Congress is likely to be very largely attended. The place of meeting although not large is central and convenient of access, and the Bishop of Peterborough will attract as Chairman; his opening address is likely to prove the most important ecclesiastical speech of the year. Dr. Magee is not only practical and sagacious, but also eloquent and witty, and his speech is looked forward to by all parties with the greatest interest. The programme of subjects and selected speakers is excellent, although we wish it had contained one or more strictly theological, educational, antiquarian, or scientific subjects. The discussion of such questions by competent men are often more eminently practical, instructive, and useful than many of the purely social questions that are to be discussed, without perhaps being in any degree solved, at Leicester. It would, we believe, conduce to edification if fewer of such subjects were

taken in hand and much more time given to their discussion. Two hours given to the discussion of "The Church and the Poor," or "The Temperance Question" cannot, we imagine, conduce much to the settlement of those questions, and if we are only to hear one side on semi-political questions of this sort incalculable mischief may be done. Inasmuch as we hold that the absence of proper provision for the systematic teaching of the Bible to the young is the weak point in our Church's mintstrations, we are sorry to see that the question of Sunday Schools and Bible Classes are not to be canvassed. We know that in former years such discussions have been attended with the happiest results. Probably the Church of England is the only Church which does not, except in short-lived Confirmation Classes, provide her children with continuous and systematic instruction in the Holy Scriptures. We gladly admit that much is done, though in an irregular manner, to supply this deficiency by the voluntary teachers in our Sunday Schools for an hour or so each week. If the Congress would devise some means of supplying this great *desideratum* in the Churches' teaching, it would strengthen the hold of the Church on the affections of the people.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CIRCUMCISION.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—One point in my letters having been strangely misunderstood by "G. T.," may I endeavour to be more explicit?

At present I am of opinion that St. Paul was better acquainted with all the bearings of Circumcision than any of us are, and must have known whether it acted in any degree as a preventive of one dreadful class of sins. I believe all manner of sins of impurity were at least as prevalent as now (Rom. i.), and that the Apostle was more cognizant of that fact than we are. If he believed Circumcision diminished such sins, I think he would have said so, and recommended the adoption of *that rite to effect that purpose*, even while he discarded its adoption as a religious rite. The fact that he did not so recommend it appears as if he did not believe it to be thus efficacious, and leads me to desire stronger evidence in favour of the opinion put forth in your paper before accepting it. My reference to 1 Cor. vii. 9 it was supposed would be regarded as follows. That passage shows the Apostle mentioned a remedy for incontinence and burning; in other words, he mentioned a remedy for sins of that class when he knew of one. This affords grounds for concluding he would have mentioned Circumcision also as a prevention to sins of a similar nature had he known it to be a prevention.

The main question doubtless is this—*Is Circumcision useful in this way, as has been asserted?* Notwithstanding the repetition of the opinion, I venture to say that sufficient reason to warrant such conclusion has not yet been furnished. Is it maintained that the experience of one medical man, no matter how able, and his opinion founded thereon, are sufficient grounds for authorising the conclusion? Has his experience of circumcised races been sufficiently extensive? If so, do their superior health and morality arise from their adoption of that rite? A very large induction is surely called for, and a more general expression of opinion by eminent medical men. We know that hasty conclusions and dogmatic assertions of scientific men of considerable eminence do an immensity of mischief; the frequent repetitions of their assertions are taken as proofs that their assertions are not to be questioned, and too often infidelity results. Let us not be like them. While willing and glad to accept well-established facts and well-grounded opinions, let us not adopt every opinion of individual men of repute without being satisfied that the subject has been thoroughly examined with cautious, patient, diligent investigation, proportionate to its importance. R. G.

SIR,—Your correspondent "R. G." doubts the sanitary benefits of Circumcision, questions your appeal to the health of Jews, Turks, Zulus, and other circumcised races, and asks for the medical opinions of others than the one you quoted of Dr. Gibbon. Will you allow me to refer him to a paper *On the Influence of Circumcision in preventing Syphilis*, by Mr. Jonathan Hutchinson, in the "Medical Times and Gazette" for 1855, where that eminent surgeon clearly demonstrates from about two hundred cases, that the circumcised Jew in London is four times less liable to contract this horrible disease, which is incurable, and when once contracted is passed on to wife and children for five or six generations, than uncircumcised persons. He adds "Taking then this fact as established, it suggests itself, as possible, that Circumcision was made by Divine Command obligatory on the Jews, not solely as a religious ordinance, but also with a view to the protection of health."

In the Edinburgh "Medical Journal," vol. xx., for 1874, p. 282, an Egyptian surgeon, M. Aïssa Hamdy, strongly insists on its value from a hygienic point of view, and states that the operation is a preservative against venereal disease, onanism, and certain troublesome and crippling affections of the genito-urinary organs. There are many other medical opinions to the same effect in modern Medical Literature, so that "R. G." may accept as a fact that the sanitary influence of the rite is very great, despite the medical, or rather sanitary, opinion of St. Paul, who was unable to cure himself of "the thorn in his flesh." The lawfulness of this operation is a matter of high importance to the moral as well as physical health of the nation. There can, I think, be no question that it was abolished by religious opinion, and if it is to be again generally adopted, it must be so with the full sanction of Divines and Theologians. You are doing a blessed work in agitating this very practical question.

MEDICUS.

TESTIMONIAL TO THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

SIR,—As one of those whose privilege it is to be engaged, however humbly, in promoting the special fund towards endowing the Bishopric of Southwell, as one feature in the Testimonial to the brave and faithful Bishop of Lincoln, will you allow me to make known through your columns that any sum, however small, will be gladly accepted, in order not to exclude from participation in this good work those faithful Church-people who

might otherwise be excluded, by limited means, from a share in it. Names need not be given, unless desired. Let me express an earnest hope that all who feel grateful to the Bishop of Lincoln for his noble stand for the religious liberties and the constitutional rights of the Church against the *un*constitutional Burials Bill, will contribute to this fund, each according to his ability.

W. M. H. CHURCH.

Hickleton, Doncaster, 9th Sept., 1880.

SIR,—Many admirers of the Bishop of Lincoln having expressed a desire to do more than simply attach their names to an *Address of Thanks* to him for his brave opposition to the Burials Bill, as one of the Secretaries of the "Southwell Bishopric Endowment and Residence Funds," I beg leave to announce that, with the authority of the Bishop of Nottingham, I am ready to receive (the sum of £36 10s. 6d. has been subscribed in addition to previous statement) Subscriptions, from 2s. 6d. and upwards, towards these Funds, as a substantial mark of respect for the Bishop, and as a means of helping to accomplish that which he so earnestly desires, viz., the subdivision of his Diocese. P.O.O. should be drawn on the Brigg Office.

CHARLES W. MARKHAM.

The Rectory, Saxby, Barton-on-Humber.

The Bishop of Nottingham has just presented a second address to the Bishop of Lincoln from 1,400 of the clergy, thanking him for his speech in Parliament against the Burials Bill, and accompanied by the following letter:—"Leasingham, Sleaford, Sept. 11th, 1880.—My dear Lord Bishop and Brother,—I have now the pleasure of presenting a second address to your lordship, supplemental to the first, offered a short time ago by upwards of six hundred of the clergy of your own diocese, in which they expressed their grateful thanks to you for your eloquent and touching speech in Parliament against the Burials Bill, and in defence of the rights of the Church. The second address has been signed by upwards of fourteen hundred of the clergy of the Church of England, who, entirely unsolicited, have expressed their desire to adopt the same address, and to present it to you through my instrumentality, as a proof of their gratitude to your lordship for the course you have taken with respect to the Burials Bill, whilst not a few have eagerly desired to do more, as a token of their respect and affection, which will no doubt soon come to pass. I have reason to believe that many more of the clergy are about to send in their signatures to the address, which I can still accept and record through an addenda to be subsequently attached to it; but for various reasons I think it best not to delay its presentation any longer. Hence I beg, in the name of the signatories, and in my own, to have the honour of presenting this address to your lordship at once, as a token of our gratitude and profound respect.—I am, your affectionate brother, E. NOTTINGHAM."

BIBLICAL REVISION.

SIR,—Mr. Tupper's letter in the *Standard* expresses an anxiety felt by many as to the manner in which the Amende Version will be regarded by the vast majority of Bible-reading English men and women, if placed in their hands without any clue to the reason for the emendaions.

Few, perhaps, are even aware of the nnmber and importance of the proposed corrections. The Bishop of Gloucester has stated that there will probably be "one change in every four verses due to textual criticism, and about one change in each verse due to grammar and general exegesis." Now, to those who are unable to ascertain why these changes have been made each amendment will be a source of perplexity, greater in proportion to its importance.

To meet this difficulty allow me, through your columns, earnestly to recommend all sincere lovers of the Bible to learn to read at least the New Testament in its original language. From long experience I can assure them that it is not only possible, but easy, to acquire a sufficient knowledge of Greek to enable them to understand the nature of the greater part of the corrections that will probably be made. The same Bishop affirms that, "no one who is really in earnest, and to whom God has given a fair measure of ability, can for a moment justly plead that an accurate knowledge of the Greek Testament is beyond his grasp, and a power of analysing the connection of its weighty sentences not abundantly ministered." Dean Alford says:—"The language is an easy one; the amount of your present knowledge of the sacred text will be a vast help to you: only begin."

If, during the coming winter, the Clergy and others would form adult classes for the study of Greek throughout the length and breadth of the land, I believe that the Revision of the Bible would soon be regarded as a necessity, and welcomed as a national blessing.

W. H. MORRIS.

Clifden House, Brentford, September 14.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTENARY OF THE EPISCOPATE IN ENGLAND.

SIR,—We have had endless celebrations this summer of the centenary of Sunday-schools. Allow me to ask my fellow-Churchmen if they will not be acting somewhat strangely if they allow the year 1880, the *seventeenth* centenary of the establishment of Epicopacy in this country, to pass without some celebration to mark this event?

At the end of 1878, I suggested to the editor of *Crockford's Directory* the desirability of giving *full lists* of Bishops, instead of merely the lists of those appointed since 1800. I see that he has adopted the suggestion in this year's issue; and those of your readers who have this year's volume will see that the first bishopric founded in this country is represented by one of the South Wales Sees, Dubritius having been the first Bishop.

H. C. RICHMOND.

22, Scarisbrick-street, Southport, Sep. 10, 1880.

The Duchess Dowager of Cleveland has given £1,000 towards the endowment fund of the Bishopric of Newcastle.

On Sunday morning the Rev. Brooke Lambert, who has succeeded the late Canon Miller as vicar of Greenwich, read himself in at the parish church of St. Alphege. In the afternoon he delivered an address to a large body of children, and in the evening preached to a crowded congregation at St. Mary's.

The Rev. Septimus Hansard, rector of Bethnal-green, who had been confined to his bed with a very severe attack of typhoid fever for the last six weeks, has been pronounced out of danger.

The statement that Mr. Mackonochie, of St. Alban's, Holborn, will be present at the opening of the General Church Convention of the United States next month, is untrue, as he returns to London from Canada this week.

A painted window has just been put in the church of St. Michael, Littlethorpe, Ripon, by the parishioners, to the memory of the late Mrs. Nunn, wife of the Rev. H. D. Cust Nunn, vicar and Rural Dean. It has been supplied by Messrs. Ward and Hughes.

The Bishop of London has appointed the Rev. Dr. Baker, Head Master of Merchant Taylors' School, to the Prebend of Ealdstreet, and the Rev. Daniel Moore, vicar of Holy Trinity, Paddington, to that of Oxgate.

The Bishop of Liverpool was unable to fulfil his engagements on Sunday in consequence of indisposition, caused by over-exertion and a severe choleraic attack. In the evening, however, his lordship was much better, though still weak.

A correspondent informs us that the number of certificates granted to pupils of King's College School by the Oxford and Cambridge Board of Examiners should have been twenty-seven instead of twenty-six; eleven boys passed with distinction, with twenty-six "Capitals."

At the ensuing diocesan conference at St. Albans, the following resolution with regard to Church patronage is to be moved:—"That a committee of this conference be appointed to consider the law and existing practice as to the sale, exchange, and resignatien of ecclesiastical benefices." The subject is to be introduced by Mr. U. U. Heathcote and the Rev. H. T. Armfield, rector of Colne Engaine, Essex.

The Ven. Canon Watkins, Archdeacon of Northumberland and Canon of Durham, has been appointed to the newly established Professorship of Hebrew in the University of Durham, and Mr. W. E. Gabbett, M.A. of Lincoln College, Oxford, to a Senior Tutorship in the same University. Mr. Gabbett was in the First Class in Moderations in 1875 and in the Final Classical School in 1876. The appointments have been made by the Dean of Durham, as Warden of the University.

The local arrangements for the Leicester Church Congress are not complete. A large hall has been erected close to the railway station specially adapted for the purposes of the meetings. The town is preparing to give the congress a most hearty welcome. The Mayor, Mr. John Bennett, though a Nonconformist, is inviting the members to a *conversazione* to be held at the close of the proceedings. Special trains will be run by the Midland and London and North-Western Railway Companies on the local lines to suit the convenience of those attending the Congress from the neighbourhood.

According to the *Lincoln Gazette and Times*, the funeral of a poor woman named Mawer, a widow of eighty-three, was appointed to take place at Greetham yesterday week, when the Burial Service was read by the rector, but there was no grave provided. The coffin was placed on the grass and left there, no one in the village being willing to dig the grave. On Thursday the medical officer of health for the district conferred with the magistrates, who ordered that a grave should be dug and the body at once interred, and this was done the same day, the rector once more attending and reading, for the second time, the concluding portion of the Burial Service.

The Clouds in the East.—The *Herald of Peace* remarks:—"We are very anxious as to the issue of the negotiations now going on between the Great Powers and the Porte. It would be a miserable thing to have another war on account of the Turks. It would drive many of us almost to despair if the present Government, after denouncing their predecessors in such vehement terms for their warlike policy, and after having been brought to power, by the popular suffrage, distinctly on the assumption that they were to be a pacific administration, were now to plunge us again into a course of violence and bloodshed. We own we do not like their meddlesome propensites, and the constant talk, on the part of some of their partisans, as to the necessity of applying force to secure the execution of the Treaty of Berlin. Have we not work enough on our hands, in our own vast Empire, without attempting to become a sort of little Providence for all mankind, and especially without attempting another settlement of the Eastern embroglio, in conjunction with allies who have different interests from ours, and who will, in all probability, leave us in the lurch, if they do not openly, or covertly, traverse our councils?" The *Herald* deprecates the dangerous policy of attempting to bully or "coerce" Turkey by mere demonstrations, and adds:—"Great importance is attached to the words of the Prime Minister, who in one of his Midlothian speeches said, 'there is not a case upon record in which united Europe having made up its mind to tell the Sultan of Turkey what must be done, the Sultan of Turkey has not had the good sense to do it." With all respect we venture to differ even from so great an authority. It is surprising that Mr. Gladstone did not remember the Vienna note, when 'united Europe made up its mind to tell the Sultan of Turkey what must be done,' and when the Sultan of Turkey nevertheless peremptorily, almost contemptuously, rejected their counsel, and so brought about the Crimean war." It further shows that even *six months after the battle of Navarino* (in 1829), *no terms had been obtained for the Greeks*. So that the incident, often cited to prove the efficacy of coercion without war, proves the exact reverse. The Turks absolutely disregarded the mandate of the Great Powers, even when backed not only by menace, not only by naval demonstration, but by the destruction of their fleet and the blockade and reduction of the Morea. At the end of this long process of "coercion without war," undertaken for the benefit of the Greeks, the historian had to confess that "no terms had been obtained from the Greeks." "The beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water." This is what the advocates of force constantly ignore or forget. Mr. Wilberforce, who was in intimate relations with Pitt, says that when the latter embarked in war with France, he was persuaded it would be over in one campaign. And when our people were clamouring for war in 1854, they expected only a short "brush with Russia." So it is constantly. In truth, no one can tell, if we once embark on this sea of warlike adventure in Turkey, whither we should drift."

Except that the singing of the *Agnus Dei* and *Benedictus* during the celebration of Holy Communion is omitted, and a prayer before sermon has superseded the hitherto customary form of invocation, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," no alterations have been made in the services at St. Peter's, Bournemouth. It is stated, however, that some changes are contemplated with a view to render the morning service more cheerful, such, for instance, as the singing of the Litany.

J. Abbott, pupil of the Rev. H. A. G. Oliver, St. John's-wood School, has been elected to an open Scholarship at St. Paul's School.

Mr. A. S. Butler, the newly appointed Professor of Natural Philosophy at St. Andrew's University, was installed on Saturday afternoon.

On Thursday the Bishop of Liverpool consecrated another church, that of St. John the Evangelist, Walton, the foundation-stone of which was laid by Lord Skelmersdale in 1876. An attempt was made by a number of persons to stay the consecration through objections offered to a reredos by Mr. Woolner, R.A. It is described as "a piece of sculpture containing in relief a full-length figure representing our Saviour extended on a cross, with figures of the Virgin Mary and St. John at the foot of it, affixed to the wall over the communion table." The work was originally designed for Mrs. Gerard Leigh's private chapel at Luton Hoo, Bedfordshire, but, being too large for it, was stowed away. She subsequently presented it to the parish church of Walton-on-the-Hill, of which one of her relatives is rector, but was found that it would obscure the east window, so it was presented by Mrs. Leigh to the new district church, and has been used ever since. Replying to the memorialists on the 7th inst., Bishop Ryle said:—"I do not like the sculpture over the communion-table, and I do not like the separation between the chancel and the body of the church. Speaking for myself, I should never think of adorning or arranging a church in such fashion. But the question is not what I like personally, or dislike, but what is legal; or rather what is not forbidden by the law of the Church of England. Now, I am informed by my legal officials that there is nothing in the church of St. John the Evangelist, Walton, which exceeds the limits allowed by the law of the Church of England. Under the circumstances I do not see that I can refuse to consecrate the church, whatever my own private feelings may be. If I call upon others to respect and obey the law, I must not set an example of disregarding legal decisions myself.

A conference between the rector of Clewer, the Rev. Roland Errington, successor to Canon Carter, and some of his leading parishioners has just been held with regard to the employment of the Clewer Sisters of Mercy as district visitors in connection with the church, which is looked upon as an obstacle to the restoration to union among the parishioners, which it was hoped would take place on the appointment of a new rector. The rector presided at the conference.—Mr. E. B. Foster (Clewer Manor) and Mr. Barry (St. Leonard's), two of the principal parishioners, objected to the Sisters of Mercy being recognised as visitors in connection with the parish, alleging their identification with the late rector, Canon Carter, urging that it would be impossible for them to unite in any parochial work on account of the anti-Protestant character of their practices and teaching.—The rector, while desirous of securing the support and sympathy of the whole parish in his work, was not prepared to dissociate the work of the Sisters of Mercy from the church. He said that the work of the Sisters would be entirely under his supervision, and if they taught any doctrines or adopted any practices which were not sanctioned by the Church of England he should exercise his authority to discountenance it. He avowed himself strongly in favour of retaining the services of the Sisters of Mercy, and stated that he had conferred with the late rector upon the subject, who had spoken with strong feeling upon the excellent work which they had done and were doing. He had also conferred with the Bishop upon the subject, who had expressed similar views. Mr. Errington further spoke of the difficulty of organising an agency independently of the Sisters of Mercy, as there were no parishioners to undertake the duties, and moreover the work of the Sisters of Mercy would go on just the same, whatever other agency might be formed.—Mr. Barry mentioned that he had lived a considerable time in Spain, and he had seen a great deal of the evils of the confessional.—The Rector, in reply to this, said he was not aware of the compulsory use of confession anywhere i nthe parish of Clewer.—It was understood that the result of the conference, which lasted a considerable time, was that the rector announced his resolve to retain the Sisters of Mercy in connection with the Church work in the parish.—*Times.*

On Wednesday Bishop Ryle consecrated his first new church in the diocese of Liverpool. The need of increased church accommodation has been long felt in the parish of Maghull, and in July, 1876, the parishioners at a meeting expressed an opinion that an effort should be made to erect a new church capable of accommodating about six hundred. A suitable site, adjoining the churchyard of the old Church of St. Andrew, was presented to the parish by Mr. Thomas Whalley, of Waterloo. The Bishop, in preaching from St. Mark xiii. 2, said we could not have too handsome churches, or services too beautiful, so long as we keep within the limits of the law. He, for one, rejoiced that the dress and demeanor of the clergy were prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer; but after all the great question was, Do we live up to the Gospel which we profess? We might perform in their due order every part of Prayer-book services, but that would be useless unless we loved and served God. The splendour of the Temple ritual did not save it; and we must see that we did not leave our hearts behind us when we came to worship God, for else taking part in the service and going through appropriate gestures would be useless:—"It had been well said that the early Christians worshipped God with wooden chalices, and had golden ministers; but when the Church in the middle ages had golden communion-plate, her ministers were too often wooden. His earnest hope was that for many years to come in that church the worship might be real and of the best, and that the whole counsel of God might be faithfully declared. Where were the Churches of St. Augustine and St. Athanasius, and other early fathers who had laboured much and written much? Their candlesticks had been removed. Let us watch and pray for the old Church of England, that her people may remain true to her Articles, Liturgy, and Prayer-book, guarding against formality, and aiming after greater holiness of life in our family and social relations." At the luncheon the Bishop said he was not narrow-minded, and hoped he was ready to give the right hand of fellowship to every man who wished to help forward the cause of the Church of Christ; but when matters came to a crisis it would not do to stand on trifles. He hoped that amongst those who were not entirely agreed upon all points in the Church of England there would still be a bond of union, and that they would all do what they could to maintain the Church against all comers. The longer he lived the more he realised what they had to do against infidelity and utter indifference, and he trusted that in Lancashire he should never appeal in vain for help to do the work.

The Rev. William Rogers, rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate, is gradually but very slowly recovering from the effects of the serious accident which he met with in riding in Hertfordshire in the early part of the summer. He is at Brighton, where he is able to take exercise in a wheel chair; and it is hoped that he may be able to return home before the end of the year.

The Queen has permitted Lord Braye to hang up the sword of his elder brother, the Hon. Edmund Verney Wyatt-Edgell, who was killed at the battle fought at Ulundi against the Zulus, in the Brave Chapel at St. George's, Windsor, and almost immediately over the body of Sir Reginald Braye. At first it was understood that her Majesty intended placing the statue of the Prince Imperial either in the Braye Chapel or in the nave, but it is probable that a more convenient site will be chosen in the aisle north of the chancel, near the grave of Edward IV. Captain Wyatt-Edgell was one of those sent a few weeks before the battle of Ulundi to recover the body of the Prince Imperial.

The following protest was published last Sunday in the church of Avebury by the Rev. Bryan King :—"In the Name of the Father, &c. Whereas by a recent act of the secular Legislature our churchyards, which have been solemnly consecrated to the service of our Lord Jesus Christ through His Church, have been thrown open to the ministrations of men, women, and even children of every form of schism and misbelief, I, Bryan King, vicar of Avebury, do hereby publish this my solemn protest against the aforesaid act of the Legislature, as an act by which the sin of sacrilege is legalised, and by which the sacred rights with which I have been put in trust by the Church are unrighteously invaded."

Earl Granville on Church Extension.—Earl Granville on the 14th instant laid the foundation-stone of the extension of St. Andrew's Church, Buckland, Dover. His Lordship said that although a most appropriate sermon had just been delivered from the pulpit of the old edifice, it might be desirable that one of the laity should express for them that they all felt equally interested with the clergy in this good and holy work. It was said in the sermon that there were changes of thought and feeling which sometimes moved and sometimes depressed the populations. He believed that during the last fifty years a great movement had been taking place in the Church of England. Much more action and much more energy, sometimes accompanied by defects in religious action; but, on the whole, there was immense vitality in the Established Church. There was no greater test of this than Church extension, when that was done not merely out of feeling, as it were, of ostentatious piety, but with a view to really meet the requirements of the people for their religious nourishment. In this parish there was already 3,000 people, but in the church as it now stood they had only accommodation for 350. The addition about to be made would, however, only accomodate 750 more, thus doubling the accommodation which now existed. They ought to realise to themselves the pace with which the population increased in this country. When he was a young man he was constantly in the habit of travelling up and down the Dover Road. This year he looked forward with increased pleasure to renewing his youthful associations by deserting the railway and coming up by road. He was bound to say he felt somewhat disheartened on remembering that half the road over which he used to travel was now half covered with houses. Not only for the Church of England, but for the sake of religion itself, he hoped the good work so well begun would be brought to a successful end.

BOOKS, &c., RECEIVED.

"THE ONE OFFERING." By M. F. Sadler. Bell and Sons.
"GOSPEL FOR XIXTH CENTURY." Longmans & Co.
"WILL THE FOUNDATION BEAR." William Poole.
"PRESENCE OF CHRIST." Do.
"COME UNTO ME." Do.
"WHAT IS JESUS CHRIST DOING FOR ME NOW?" Do.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arthy, Rev. William Robert Bridge, chaplain of Henshaw's Blind Asylum and the Manchester Deaf and Dumb Institution, at Old Trafford.

Atherton, Rev. Robert Heys, vicar of St. Matthew, Stepney.

Baker, Rev. Dr., head master of the Merchant Taylors' School, prebendary of Ealdstreet in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Blackburne, Rev. S., vicar of Steep; rector of Beesby, Lincolnshire.

Brodrick, Rev Francis Edward, vicar of Farnley, Leeds.

Buckley, Rev. Joseph, chaplain to the Duke of Beaufort and rector of Sopworth and Badminton; rector of Tormarton.

Egerton, Rev. Brooke de M., vicar of Brackley, Surrogate.

Eyre, Rev. J. R., vicar of St. Michael-le-Hamlet, Liverpool.

Horne, Rev. Joseph White, vicar of St. James-the-Apostle, Islington.

Johnstone, Rev. W. M., rector of Ballymoney, County of Antrim; rector of St. Stephen's, Twickenham.

Kyte, Rev. J. W., curate of Flixborough with Burton-on-Stather; vicar of Wood Ditton with Saxon Street.

Mason, Rev. F. W. R., rector of Beesby; vicar of Steep, Hampshire.

Moore, Rev. Daniel, vicar of Holy Trinity, Paddington; prebendary of Oxgate in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Northmore, Rev. Thomas Welby, vicar of Weston, Otley.

Perkins, Rev. C. M., rector of Sopworth and Badminton.

Rees, Rev. E. J., senior curate of Oswestry; senior chaplain to the Bishop of Bedford.

Sotheby, Rev. W. E. H., curate in sole charge; vicar of Holy Trinity, Hoxton.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Alderson, Rev. Christopher, M.A., for forty-four years rector of Kirkheaton, on the 11th inst., aged 78.

Bower, Rev. James Henry, at Teignmouth, of the Larches, East Sheen, Surrey, formerly vicar of Newnham, in the county of Kent, on the 9th inst.

Boys, Rev. Thomas, M.A., at Kentish-town, vicar of Holy Trinity, Hoxton, on the 2nd inst., aged 88.

Bucknill, Rev. G., M.A., vicar of High Ercall, Wellington, Salop, on the 6th inst., aged 63.

Dowling, Rev. Edward, at the Vicarage, thirty years vicar of Timperley, Cheshire, on the 9th inst., aged 62.

Lee, Rev. John I., at St. Thomas's Hospital, from the result of a railway accident, vicar of Thetford, Norfolk.

Lowder, Rev. C. F., at the Trone Hotel, Zell an See, after a short illness, vicar of St. Peter's, London Docks, on the 9th inst.

Rogers, Rev. John Cecil, at Portarlington, late rector of Nohoval, county Cork, son of Rev. George William Rogers, rector of Rower, Diocese of Ossory, and grandson of the Rev. George Rogers, rector of Clonallan and Chancellor of Dromore, on the 3rd inst.

Watson, Rev. Thomas, at the Vicarage, thirty years vicar of East Farleigh, near Maidstone, Kent, on the 12th inst., aged 86.

The Church of England Pulpit.

"THE SECOND IS LIKE UNTO IT."

By the Rev. JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A.,
Professor of Moral Philosophy;
formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached in the Chapel of King's College, London.

"Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." St. Matt. xxii. 37—40.

I PROPOSE to-day to speak of the connexion of these two great commandments, and especially of the relation which the second bears to the first. "The second is like unto it," our Lord says; and so St. John, "Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God, and everyone that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God;" "if a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar."

This truth has not been always kept in mind, or carried out in action, by those who have made the loudest profession of obedience to one or the other law; neither, on the one hand, by those who have prided themselves most on their religious zeal; nor, on the other hand, by those who have especially arrogated to themselves the title of philanthropists. "The time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service," are the words of Christ himself; and there is no sadder or darker page in the history of humanity than that which tells of persecutions and tortures inflicted in the name of religion, and not seldom at the instigation or under the sanction of men like Calvin or Francis de Sales, of whose sincerity and uprightness we can entertain no reasonable doubt. Nor can we safely assume that the religious fanaticism which was the cause of so much misery in the Albigensian persecutions of the Middle Ages, or the Dragonades of Louis XIV., is entirely extinct among us now. The language of party organs, and the principles openly advocated by leading writers and speakers, give us no security against a recurrence of the tragic scenes of former days if the restraining hand of the Civil Power were withdrawn. It has become a commonplace that the remark which would rise to the lips of a stranger on observing the spectacle presented by the divisions of Christendom would not be "See how these Christians love," but "See how they hate each other." Religion, while it draws together the members of each section of Christians, seems to multiply and widen the lines of demarcation by which men are naturally separated; it makes up for the increase of charity in one quarter by the intensifying of hostility in others. The sectarian tone is, "Join our body, submit your judgment to ours; then every allowance will be made for human frailty; stand aloof, and we have no eye for human virtue, in fact would almost prefer vice, because it makes no pretence of rivalling us, and supplies the natural foil to our own purity." And therefore in all ages narrowness, strictness, harshness, want of justice, of generosity, of large-minded fairness and charity, have with more or less reason been imputed to religious men by their adversaries. We who call ourselves religious men must confess this with shame; though we may at the same time remind our censors that by far the largest amount of practical philanthropical effort has been stimulated by religious motives, and that institutions for the relief of distress and for the benefit of those who are unable to help themselves are, with scarcely an exception, the invention or the exclusive possession of Christianity. But the point which the text brings before us goes further than this. It is not a balance of practical usefulness against a morose pharisaism, but, wherever there have been traces of such pharisaism, we may boldly say that it is more opposed to the spirit of Christianity than it is to the highest secular morality. Religious men may have hidden their treasure in earthen vessels, but the treasure itself is free from all such alloy. "He that loveth not his brother abideth in death," "he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God,"—where has the enthusiasm of humanity reached a higher level than this, which pervades the Epistles of St. John? What secularist ever hymned the praises of brotherly love in such glowing terms as St. Paul uses, when he exalts it above all gifts, all knowledge, all mysteries, all faith, treating all as worthless in comparison with charity?

And now let us turn to the other side, and see what is the result of an exclusive regard to the second of the two great commandments. In the present day there are three classes of men who are disposed to confine the idea of duty to our relations with our fellow-men; either because they absolutely deny the existence of God, or because they think that nothing can be known about Him, or because they hold that there is something anthropomorphic about the idea of duty altogether, and therefore that it is idle to speak of duty on the part of feeble creatures such as we are, towards the Absolute and the Infinite. One class consists of those in whom the spiritual organ is defective, those whom St. Paul speaks of as carnal, or "psychical" men; the second of those who cannot believe without strict logical proof, and find a stumbling-block in the demand for faith beyond the limits of actual proof—a demand made not by Christianity only, but by religion of whatsoever kind, nor yet by religion only, but by morality, by affection, by the common course of everyday life; while the third consists of those who are repelled, not by logical, but by moral difficulties, partly arising from a misunderstanding of the form

in which revelation has come to us, as the history of God's education of mankind, and thus judging the earlier stages from the standing-point of the latter; and partly from making Christianity itself responsible for all the narrow dogmatism which has been based upon it, as well as for the faults and weaknesses of individual Christians. All these classes join to swell the tide of Secularism. Their theory of duty was given in its best form by a great teacher who has gone from us, John Stuart Mill. Though he was far from accepting the Christian revelation, and considered even the existence of God as at best a doubtful probability, he yet claims the authority of Christ for the Utilitarian philosophy. In his own words, (1) "'to do as you would be done by, and to love your neighbour as yourself,' constitute the ideal perfection of Utilitarian morality. In the golden rule of Jesus of Nazareth we read the complete spirit of the ethics of Utility." When we remember that Utilitarianism is professedly based upon and developed out of the Epicurean principle of self-love, we may well rejoice at its having so far outgrown its origin. That a view of life which must always exercise a great practical influence in the world, should have incorporated into itself feelings and beliefs which are commonly associated with an entirely opposite school, that, in fact, selfishness should have been transformed into generous and thoughtful action for the good of all, this is indeed a matter for grateful acknowledgment.

Still the question remains, is the rule here given sufficient in itself, can the second commandment stand thus isolated? In the passage just quoted it appears in two forms, one referring to action, "do as you would be done by," the other to feeling, "love your neighbour as you love yourself." Is it enough then that a man should always do to others as he would wish them to do to him? Does this supply a satisfactory rule for our actions? Does it necessarily lead to virtuous conduct? Take the example of a sensualist: what he wishes to have done is to have his senses and appetites gratified, to be spared all pain of self-denial. To act towards others as he would wish them to act towards him, might lead to the worst possible consequences. A drunken and profligate father brings up a son, whom he loves as well as he can love any other being, in habits of drunkenness and profligacy, which will ensure his ruin in this life and the next. A man intent on money-making stunts every higher faculty in his son, in order to make him devote all his energies to this one pursuit, *et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas*. (2) And so for all other vicious and perverted natures. Nor will the rule for feeling lead to any better result. "Love others as you love yourself;" but what is the *love* of the sensualist, and what is the *self* which he loves? In loving himself he seeks only to indulge the lower self, what the Bible calls the flesh: if he loves another, *as* himself, he loves the corresponding self in another, that self which is brought out in eating and drinking, and the coarser pleasures of companionship. It is needless to say that such love affords no rule of virtue, no pathway to happiness, but is the source of infinite misery and degradation to the human race. Before you can apply the rule "love thy neighbour as thyself," you must be sure that the man you address loves himself rightly, and loves his right self; before you can safely say "do to others as thou wouldest they should do to thee," you must be sure that he wishes others to act rightly by him. You must leave, that is, the simple ground of fact, that which *is*, and rise to the ideal, that which *should be*, before you can dare to lay this down as an absolute principle of morality. The rule therefore must be modified before it can be applied, even in cases to which it is apparently applicable, *i.e.* in cases which immediately concern our fellow-men. An action is not made right because it is one in which many are concerned, and in which all who are concerned take pleasure. But besides this there are cases of morality which do not directly come under the rule, cases of secret and solitary sin, which are only indirectly and in the long run injurious to others, by vitiating the character of the individual, and so helping to lower the general standard; accordingly it has sometimes happened that such sins have been condoned, and even advocated, by those who professed to aim solely at the promotion of the national welfare and the increase of human happiness. Mill himself, as it appears to me, has spoken rash and foolish words in connection with this subject, (3) though of course he is entirely free from the charge of justifying immorality, and indeed assumes for the most part a lofty and almost ascetic standard, not the agent's own greatest happiness, but the greatest amount of happiness to the world in general, the readiness to promote which by the absolute sacrifice of one's own happiness, he calls the highest virtue which can be found in man. (4) But in all this there is a transcending of the matter-of-fact rule, "do as thou wouldest be done by;" there is an acknowledgment of an ideal of duty to be aimed at and striven after —that same ideal which appears in his distinction between happiness and content, and between higher and lower pleasures.

But how and where is this ideal to be found? Has it any permanent or real existence, any power to make itself felt or seen or heard, any means of punishing those who neglect or disregard it? Or is it simply a dream, a fanciful imagination with which one here may please to amuse himself, while another there is equally at liberty to throw it aside, or select its opposite for his guidance. Is the voice of the moralist to be simply "I recommend this course of action as on the whole productive of most pleasure,"

(1) "Utilitarianism," p. 24, 1st ed.

(2) Juvenal, Sat. viii. 84.

(3) The allusion is to such language as follows: "Little improvement can be expected in morality, until the producing large families is regarded with the same feelings as drunkenness or any other physical excess."—*Political Economy*, i. 448, 3rd edition.

(4) "Utilitarianism," pp. 16, 23.

or may he speak with authority, and demand of each man that he shall act up to the end for which in his inmost heart he feels that his nature was intended, quite apart from the question whether it is productive of pleasure or pain. There are some to whom the ideal seems to reveal itself in everything to force itself upon them from every side: there are others for whom it seems to be almost non-existent. To some it shows itself in every act and every relation of life, in every aspect of nature and of art; all is full of poetry and of beauty, and of something higher and deeper than either. As one of the greatest poets of our century has described it.—

"I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts, a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
A motion and a spirit that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things,"

To others, on the contrary, it might seem that all life and all nature is prose—as the same poet expresses it—

"A primrose by a river's brim
A yellow primrose was to him,
And it was nothing more." (5)

And yet this is not quite the case. Even the hardest and dullest life offers some foothold for the God-given faculties of admiration, imagination, and affection; and the seeds of these faculties exist in every human heart, though they may lie dormant for years, or possibly even for a lifetime. The ever-changing beauties of the heavens, the rising and the setting sun, the solemnity of the starry sky of midnight, the fresh dews of morning, the songs of birds, the bursting of the leaf in the spring, the rich glow of autumnal foliage, the terrors of the storm, the exquisite forms and delicate tints of leaves and flowers, the more overpowering influence of forest and lake and sea and mountain,—these are tokens of an existence outside of ourselves, infinite in power and wisdom, perfect in beauty, sympathising with every higher feeling of the heart, overflowing with the tenderest compassion, yet awful in its severity of purity, and in a far-removed mysterious majesty.

And this teaching of nature on the outside is confirmed and deepened by our own experience of life, and by the records of the past history of our race. The first dawn of consciousness reveals to us a mother's unselfish devotion; as we grow in years we learn to appreciate the thoughtful justice of a father; we are taught that actions are praiseworthy and blameworthy independently of our likes or dislikes; watching our own lives and the world about us, we gradually come to feel that we are in the midst of (what has been called) "a stream of tendency which makes for righteousness," and we see its effects on a larger scale in the rise and decline of states. The ideal of life thus set before us is felt to be no mere arbitrary rule, no traditional maxim enforced upon us by external authority; it is something which carries its own authority with it; it is a law of our being, a part of our nature, yet not limited to us, but as wide in its application as the most abstract principles of geometry or of logic. That ingratitude and injustice are wrong is as universally true as that two straight lines cannot inclose a space. The admiration excited in us by every generous, noble, and self-sacrificing action, every graceful and beautiful life, helps to fill up our conception of this ideal; the indignation provoked by the sight of cruelty, injustice, and falsehood, the added shame and remorse with which we regard such actions when we have ourselves been guilty of them: these swell the tide of feeling till it grows into what Plato has called the yearning after the Ideal, what a greater than Plato has spoken of as the hungering and thirsting after righteousness. It is true we are conscious of a lower nature within us resisting and struggling against the Ideal, but we feel it as a usurpation whenever the lower nature gains the mastery: we feel that we were made in order that the higher nature might be formed within us; we acknowledge with thankfulness that it is being formed, not indeed, without strenuous effort on our own part, but in a way inexplicable by mere effort of our own, fostered, sustained, secretly stimulated and fed, by some mysterious spiritual influence surrounding us on all sides, and meeting us again in the very depths of our being. And the fact of its being thus sustained, the fact that the ideal life within has its root in that vast all-encompassing, all-penetrating life, gives rise to a strong assurance that what is now promise shall be hereafter fulfilment, that the lower nature will finally be done away with, that all discord shall cease, and our little life move on in perfect harmony with the great supporting life. And the hopes we entertain for ourselves we cannot but entertain for others. We know that in all there is the same opposition of the higher and lower nature. Even if the surface-view shows us only the working of the lower nature, yet the faith that springs from sympathy divines where the higher nature still lies hidden. And even in the most hardened and desperate, the knowledge that there is some one who has not lost hope for them, who believes in the possibility of their restoration, who longs for it, and will help them to strive for it, help, not as condescending from a higher sphere, but as a fellow-soldier engaged in the same battle—who can limit the power of such a re-awakening of hope and faith and love?

Here then we find the right interpretation of the rule "love thy neighbour as thyself." It is "love the ideal in thy neighbour as thou lovest it in thyself;" "hate, *i.e.* fight against, all that which would check the growth of the ideal, first in thyself and then in thy neighbour." And to this end we must keep our eyes open to the ideal in others. He is a poor and barren friend who sees his friend only as he is in actual achievement. See your friend idealised, glorified, as what he may be, as what by

(5) The quotations are from Wordsworth's "Tintern Abbey" and "Peter Bell."

God's grace he shall be. We make far too little use of hope in our journey through life. We hope little for ourselves, and therefore we are spiritless in our efforts for self-improvement; we hope little for others, and therefore friendship is so far less elevating and inspiring than it ought to be.

And now that we have seen the Ideal at work both in life and in nature, we may take a further step, and ask whether there is any other name under which it is known to us. Two heathen philosophers shall furnish us with an answer. All lower ideals, says Plato, are summed up in one highest Ideal, the perfection of beauty and goodness. This Ideal is to the world of mind what the sun is to the world of matter, the fountain of life and light, Love is the yearning after this Ideal, at first a dim unconscious yearning, but as it grows in purity it comes to discern its object more clearly, until at length it beholds it face to face, and then there is heaven. For this ideal is God, the Author of the universe, the Father of each individual soul (6). And Seneca shall tell us what is the ideal nature formed within each:—*sacer intra nos spiritus sedet*, "a holy spirit dwells within us;" and again, *prope est ad te deus, tecum est, intus est*, "God is near you, He is with you, He is in you" (7). Need I remind you that the same truth is proclaimed by the voice of vevelation, "in Him we live and move and have our being," "the invisible things of Him are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead," "in Him was life and the life was the light of men," "that was the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Once only has the perfect Ideal of man been seen on earth, and that Ideal was one with the Father; the ideal can be formed in each one of us only by the Spirit of Christ within us. "Abide in me and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, so neither can ye except ye abide in me;" "if Christ be in you the spirit is life because of righteousness."

Here then we may advance to a further definition of our rule. When we say "love the ideal in thy neighbour," we mean as we now see, "love that which is Christ-like, that which is God-like in thy neighbour." The natural object of love, as Plato has taught us, is the Divine perfection. That we are to love; that, in so far as our heart is in its right state, we cannot help loving, with all our soul and all our strength; all other things we shall love in so far as they embody or represent to us any portion of the Divine perfection. Thus the second commandment is like unto the first, because it is, in fact, an exemplification of it in one direction, just as we might have another exemplification, bidding us love and admire all the beauty and sublimity of outward nature, or as our Lord bids, "consider the lilies of the field."

But if this is so, if the love of nature and the love of man are, when rightly understood, only subordinate forms of the love of God, how is it that there have been so many lovers of nature and of man, who would have disclaimed the title of lovers of God? How is it that Shelley, for instance, than whom none has ever been gifted with an eye more open to the beauties of nature, few with a heart more sensitive to spiritual influences, how is it that such a man could ever have signed himself "an atheist?" How is it that men can profess a high ideal morality and yet deny both the existence of God and the immortality of the Soul? I have briefly mentioned the causes of such aberrations in an earlier part of my discourse, and need not dwell further on them now; but it is of more consequence to us to know what view we are to take of such cases. Are we to consider, as some are prone to do in the present day, that genius is its own law, and creates right and wrong, and almost truth and falsehood for itself? Or are we to change our statement about the Ideal, and assert that in this case the love and admiration of the Ideal does not mean the love and the worship of God? Surely we shall do neither of these things. The man of genius is not less, but more, responsible for his ten talents than other men are for the use of the two or the five talents. But neither on the other hand will we deny the goodness of what is good in a man, because it is mixed with imperfection. There was the spirit of worship in Shelley, but the altar which he raised was to an unknown God. To him, and to others like him, St. Paul's words might be addressed, "whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you." And the practical way for us Christians to declare this, is not by denunciation of error, but by recognition of the working of the Divine Spirit in those who are themselves unconscious of His work, and by striving that the light which is given to us may so shine out in our lives that men seeing our good works may glorify our Father which is in heaven.

The lessons, then, which we should draw from the consideration of the close connexion between the first and the second commandment are mainly two. One is, to suspect all religious emotions in ourselves which do not tend to increase our love for our fellow-men. "Pure religion aud undefiled," says St. James, "is to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." If our religion fails to do this, whatever ecstatic heights we may seem to soar to, it is mere self-deception; such religion is vain. The other is that on which we have already dwelt so much, that we are to love our fellow-men in God, as created by God, as redeemed by Christ, as called to be temples of the Holy Spirit, as all having in them the germ of a new and divine life, which it is the privilege and the duty of human love to cherish and to strengthen, until at last the whole body of the Church, "being fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, may grow up into Him in all things, which is the head, even Christ."

(6) See Plato, "Republic," vi. 505 foll.; "Symposium," 210 foll.; "Timæus," 29 foll.; and compare St. Angustine, "De Civitate Dei," viii. 6-8.

(7) Seneca, "Epist." 41.

THE OLD CATHOLIC CONGRESS AT BADEN-BADEN, 1880.

By the Rev. T. ARCHIBALD WHITE, M.A.
Christ Church, Oxon.

Sermon Preached in All Saints' Church, September 12th, 1880.

"And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."—St. Matt. xvi. 18—19.

THE greatest benefit is the purest form of religion. Every existing form of religion has its own imperfections. We must choose the best at all risks according to our conscientious convictions. Happy are we if the religion of our childhood satisfies the convictions of maturer years. There is no greater wrench in the family or to the individual than a change in that form of religion which was learnt at the mother's knee. No sober-minded person will thus change unless he or she feels unalterably convinced that such a change is imperatively required by the bidding of the Holy Spirit of God.

These remarks are caused by the presence in our midst of the Old Catholic Congress of Germany. This movement originated in the publication of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. The patience of the promoters was exhausted by the subsequent promulgation of the Infallibility of the Pope, ten years ago. They openly declared that such a decree was new teaching, and due to the influence of the Ultramontanes. They decided to form a Church for themselves, under the title of "Old" Catholic. It seems to us that Holy Scripture supports them in the deeply-important step which they have taken. It seems to us that Christian history supports them. And therefore we—English and Americans—hold out to them the right hand of fellowship, and, without pledging ourselves to approval of all their doctrines and ceremonial, we welcome the step they have taken towards our own stand-point. We feel that they have fought a good fight for ten years similar in many respects to that which our own Protestant Churches have been fighting for more than three centuries.

The German Old Catholics do but number forty-five thousand persons; yet France, Switzerland, and other Continental nations have similar bodies, so that in the aggregate the movement is no despicable one even in point of numbers. In point of learning, and in more than one instance of distinguished oratory, the movement is also worthy of consideration.

Their opponents (and may we not say our opponents?) consider that one of their main strongholds is our text. Let us read it carefully once again. St. Peter had just made his memorable confession—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

To prove from this all that has been argued implies the height of human ingenuity. St. Peter was commended for his faith, and boldness in asserting it. To assert that he was Bishop of Rome is a very questionable position. And to assert that all the Bishops of Rome have inherited St. Peter's special Apostolic commission is still more questionable. We deny that he was Bishop of Rome at all. We deny *in toto* that the Bishops of Rome are successors of St. Peter above any other Apostolic Bishops. We deny that St. Peter had even a primacy over the Apostles. At the most he was but *primus inter pares*, foremost among his equals. We deny, therefore, that a mere Italian Bishop has, without our consent, power of jurisdiction over the other Bishops of the Christian Church, whose succession from the Apostles is as undoubted as his own. It is an usurpation—nothing more or less. An usurpation without show or shadow of reason, of Scriptural authority, or of precedent in the Primitive Church. It arose by degrees because Rome was for so long the principal city of the world.

Here, then, is our stand-point. And I trust that I shall be excused for once for preaching a controversial sermon. Those who know me are aware that it is rather in my nature to avoid controversy if I can. But when I know that Roman Catholic priests are active, plausible, and successful occasionally in proselytizing from our ranks; when I know that they carefully defend their own stand-point to their own congregations, I feel that I should scarcely be doing my duty in ignoring these questions, and thereby seek my own ease. Therefore I say emphatically, Do not play with Rome. There is much that is false and unscriptural there, together with much that is primitive, lawful, and good. Separate the chaff from the grain; do not root up the tares with the wheat. The Pope has just as much reason to say that he is infallible as he has to say that no clergyman may marry, when St. Peter was himself a married man, and the Scripture says that a Bishop should be the husband of one wife, and that the test of his being fit for government in the Church of God is that he can rule his own children and household well. He who cannot do that, how can he govern in the Church of God?

No, the words addressed to St. Peter in our text were addressed to him personally. "Thou art Peter"—a rock—stedfast as a rock in thy faith—upon thy faith as upon a rock—upon such faith as thine—I will build my church; all the powers of evil shall not prevail against the impregnable bulwark of a fervent Christian's faith. "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven." Faith is the bunch of keys that opens the locks of all the doors and gates that lead to the citadel of the city of God. "And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven." "I give thee power, and commandment, as my minister, to declare and pronounce to my people, being penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their sins. Almighty God, my Father, pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe my holy Gospel."

It was necessary that to some should be given the power of pronouncing as God's Ambassadors the remission of sins. This power is given to the Apostles, and to all who should be duly ordained by them and after their deaths. How utterly subversive is all this of the claims of our opponents, how thoroughly corroborative of our own position! No wonder that with the enlightenment and advancing civilisation of this Nineteenth Century the Church of Rome should exhibit symptoms of decay, decline, and fall; whereas the Protestant Church as a whole, more especially that portion of it which we may style the Anglican Episcopal, should be spreading the wings of her influence to the furthest corners of the inhabited world.

Jesus Christ is our Pope. We want no other—we can have no better. He wants no vicar here upon earth, when He is Himself spiritually present with even two or three of His humblest worshippers. We do not need to pray to the Virgin and all the Saints, when we can go straight and boldly to *His* Throne of Grace. We are quite content with our "*Paternosters*," and will leave the "*Ave Marias*" to others. All that is truly scriptural, primitive, and Catholic (in the true sense of this last word) this we will retain, all excrescences and accretions we will fearlessly reject, knowing that the only passport to Heaven is this:—"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

As we are working our Church upon these lines we confidently look for your hearty co-operation and support. The Anglican chaplaincies upon the Continent of Europe stand in special need of help, for they have, with scarcely an exception, no endowments and parsonage houses. Many too from excess of zeal are encumbered with Church Building Debts or Loans. In this chaplaincy, for instance, there is no help from England of any kind, and there is a heavy Building Loan. If the pure principles and teaching of our Church are to be maintained upon the Continent, there must be increased liberality on the part of the laity.

It has long been desired to erect a Bishopric upon the Continent, to supervise the chaplancies in Northern and Central Europe. It is the opinion of many very experienced churchmen that this would tend to strengthen the important position which we have been enabled by God's grace to take up. A petition on the subject has been presented to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. A discussion upon it has taken place in the Convocation of Canterbury, and a committee, consisting of nine influential clergymen with four Bishops, has been formed to consider the question. The first meeting will take place in November, and the matter will shortly be introduced into the Convocation of York. I rejoice to have been privileged to take a leading part in this movement, and I feel sure that if carried to a successful issue it will tend to the consolidation of our Church abroad. Our Bishops and leading clergy and laity seem to be of the same opinion—the only difficulty in the way being the question of endowment.

Any churchman who looks gravely upon the present state of affairs, political as well as ecclesiastical, must preceive that it is the interest of each section of the great Protestant Church throughout the world, to strengthen in every possible way its own citadel and bulwarks, so as to be ready to withstand any shock of attack from whatever quarter it may come. And further than this, it becomes every section of the Protestant Church to seek re-union with the other sections, for our points of difference are really after all of comparatively slight importance, whereas our points of agreement are many and all-important. For we are all "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone; in Whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in Whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." (Ephesians ii. 20-22.)

Our teaching is strictly scriptural, the Bible is our Supreme Court of Appeal. In that we are all agreed. Our only hope of salvation is through the precious Blood of our dear Saviour Jesus Christ. We all look up to God as our Heavenly Father, and we all look for the guidance of His most Holy Spirit.

We have all retained the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. We all have a married clergy; as a body we abjure habitual Auricular Confession, masses for the dead, the doctrine of Purgatory, Priest-craft, and other abominations. And we are content to preach and teach simply Jesus Christ.

All these, brethren, are serious questions, questions of life and death, questions for which we must be ready to give our life-blood if ever (which God forbid) a religious war should again arise. They are questions on which it becomes us all to make up our minds one way or the other. A

decided line is the only satisfactory one, the only course which can bring us peace at the last. A course of wavering between the two alternatives can bring us no real peace.

Therefore I call upon you all to-day to take your stand upon the Word of God. And, believe me, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." (See Article VI.)

The Pope will tell you that you are heretics, and that your salvation is impossible unless you offer him your allegiance. I don't see this in my Bible. But I do see this, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Acts xvi. 31.) O Lord, "Thy Word is tried to the uttermost: and Thy servant loveth it," trusteth in it and believeth it. "Thy Law is the truth." (See Psalm cxix. P. B. V.)

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1880.

INASMUCH as Leicester, where the Church Congress is to assemble next week, is in close proximity to the proposed new Diocese of Southwell, and the staple trade of Leicester is identical with that of the counties of Nottingham and Derby, which are to constitute this new See, we are glad to learn from our correspondence and advertisements that an effort, indirect though it be, is to be there made to promote the Southwell Bishopric Fund. We should have been glad to see a Public Meeting as well as a Working Men's Meeting called expressly to further this most important movement, which we believe would have been strongly supported by the people of Leicester. In default of this, we wish God speed to the efforts of those gentlemen who desire to promote this object and at the same time to pay a well-deserved tribute of respect and affection to the faithful and scholarly Bishop of Lincoln. Never surely was a testimonial better deserved from every clergyman, if not scholar, of the Church of England. All Churchmen are proud of the Bishop of Lincoln, and we are glad that in his able speech on the Second Reading of the Burials Bill he vindicated the right and expediency of the Bishops retaining their seats in the Legislature. We sometimes regret that the Bishops do not take a more active part in the discussion of general political questions, and leave a stronger mark than they at present do on the legislation of the country. In fulfilling their high function as legislators they render incalculable benefits to the State as well as the Church. We heartily commend the effort of the Bishop of Lincoln, and trust that the Leicester Congress will not pass by without making a substantial recognition of this and other great services rendered to the Church, and in so doing contribute a sensible addition to the Endowment Fund of the New Bishopric. If this be done the Congress will be redeemed from the useless and unprofitable talk which, from an examination of the Programme, we last week predicted for it.

THE WORDSWORTH MEMORIAL.

The following Circular has been sent to the Clergy of the Dioceses of Lichfield and Lincoln:—

Rev. and Dear Sir,—We beg to inform you of a movement originated by many admirers of the Bishop of Lincoln, in recognition of his noble defence of the Church, on the occasion of the Burials Bill being read a second time in the House of Lords.

As perhaps you are aware this movement owes its origin to the presentation to the Bishop of Lincoln of an "Address of Thanks," prepared by the Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham, which, having been first extensively signed in the Diocese of Lincoln, has since received the signatures of many residing in other parts of England, to the number altogether of upwards of two thousand.

It has now been determined, in accordance with the expressed wish of many who have signed these Addresses, to open a "Testimonial Fund," with a view to enable his lordship's grateful admirers to present to the Bishop of Lincoln, a substantial token of gratitude, in the form of a handsome contribution towards the endowment of the proposed See of Southwell.

We beg respectfully to ask your co-operation in this movement, by enlisting the sympathy and support of those whom you may be able to influence.

An invitation to the Laity to join the movement has been already issued through the Press, and will be found in *The John Bull*, for August 28th; *The Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review*, for Sept. 4th; *The Ecclesiastical Gazette*, for Sept.; *The Church Times* next published after this date, and other Church papers, and organs of the London and Provincial Press.

It may not perhaps be generally known that the two Dioceses of Lincoln and Lichfield, which will be relieved by the creation of the See of Southwell, are considerably over four millions of acres in superficial extent, the Diocese of Lincoln being the larger of the two, with a population of 757,491, extending over the counties of

Lincoln and Nottingham, and having 988 clergy. The Diocese of Lichfield contains 1,356,869 inhabitants, 992 clergy, and comprises the counties of Staffordshire, Derbyshire and part of Shropshire. A glance at these statistics will at once show the need of sub-division of these two enormous Dioceses, and the gain that will result to their respective populations as well as to the Church at large, by the creation of the proposed See *at* Southwell, which will relieve Lincoln Diocese of the county of Nottingham, and the other Diocese of Derbyshire.

Donations towards the Testimonial Fund will be thankfully received by the Rev. C. W. Markham, Hon. Treasurer, Saxby Rectory, Barton-on-Humber. Post Office Orders should be drawn on the Brigg Office, and cheques crossed "Smith, Ellison and Co.," with whom an account has been opened in connexion with the proposed Fund.

The honorary Diocesan Local Secretaries for Exeter, Norwich, Peterboro', and York, will also gladly receive and acknowledge subscriptions.

We are, Rev. and dear sir,
Your obedient servants,
THE COMMITTEE
For promoting the "Address of Thanks" and "Memorial" to the Bishop of Lincoln.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE WORDSWORTH MEMORIAL.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—In the midst of our despondency and alarm on account of the "not altogether *discreditable piece of workmanship*" which is Mr. Osborne Morgan's boast (although willing to share a little of the *credit* with Mr. John Bright), it is some relief to us to remember that our cause also had a "Champion," whose "powerful advocacy," if not equal to the eloquence of Mr. John Bright, had the possible advantage of being employed on His side, whose Holy "Acres" were the spoils of Mr. Osborne Morgan, and the contention cannot *end* in such an issue. Though not gifted with the eloquence of the "unrivalled orator," who believes the form of service used in a country churchyard, *i.e.*, the ministrations and functions of the clergy, to be as indifferent to the Almighty as the form of Oath or Declaration administered to our Legislators in the Houses of Parliament, and though I am unfortunately labouring under a visual disadvantage which prevents my following such flights of eloquence as overwhelmed the dazed opponents of the Burials Bill, when Mr. Bright shone out so luminously, a quotation occurs to me which I would fain exemplify, or at least endorse;—"*Si natura negat, facit indignatio versum.*" Will you allow me therefore to suggest to all, whether clergy or laity, who sympathise with our present distress, that we ought not to forget the noble and courageous Bishop of Lincoln, who like a second "Athanasius Contra Mundum," strenuously—on the side of Equity and Truth—inveighed against a Bill which he declared to be unrighteous, and liable in its *modus operandi*, to incur the visitation of Divine Judgments? To this venerable Prelate, the worthy successor of St. Hugh, the Church of England, not for the first time, owes a profound debt of respectful gratitude and affection, which no words can estimate, still less repay. But we may at any rate express our gratitude in a way that—avoiding the vulgar form of testimonials, which evidently would be out of harmony with the Bishop's tastes—would yet relieve him from part of a burden which he confesses to be too great for him, and thereby probably prolong a life already far advanced, but too precious to his Diocese and the Church at large to be needlessly worn away. We all know how dear to him is the project of founding the See of Southwell, which has been planned to separate the populous county of Nottingham from Lincoln, and, in conjunction with Derbyshire, to form another Diocese, having for its centre a place where there exists already a Collegiate Establishment, and a fine Collegiate Church, from which the See would take its name. The Bishop's own princely liberality in the work of founding this See—as in other good works for the benefit of his Diocese — is not less conspicuous than his zealous defence of the rights of his clergy, and the honour of his beloved Church. But as yet the scheme is far from being carried out from want of necessary funds. Could we show our thankful regard for his earnest unflinching championship of our cause better than by each contributing something (a guinea, or half, if more be out of our power) towards the endowment of the See, the completion of which would at once diminish the good Bishop's labours, and enable him in the end to say his *Nunc Dimittis* with a lighter heart? It is true alas! that he was outvoted, and the Church's cause lost, but this is not the first time that it has been said:—"*Victrix causa Deis placuit, sed victa Catoni.*"

A Committee has been already organised, and is announced in this week's issue. It is not the *amount* so much as the *number* of subscriptions which the Committee are anxious about, and that all should bear in mind that from the peculiar nature of the case, it is pre-eminently true, "*Bis dat, qui cito dat.*"

J. S. HODSON, D.D.,
S. Luffenham Rectory, Stamford,
Diocese of Peterboro'.

———o———

Sir,—Mr. Hodson's suggestion of an address to the Bishop of Lincoln on the above subject, is in a fair way of being carried out in his lordship's own diocese, an address issued a day later than the date borne by your correspondent, Mr. Hodson's letter, being already in course of signature by "the archdeacons, rural deans, and clergy" of the diocese of Lincoln.

It may facilitate the adoption of the proposal on the part of those who, though not in his lordship's diocese, would be glad thus to support it, if the Archdeacon of Stow, Dr. Trollope, would substitute the words "Provinces of Canterbury and York" for "Diocese of Lincoln."

In the hope that others besides myself would in that case fill up the necessary form, I enclose my card, and shall be glad if you can find room in your next issue for the insertion of this suggestion, together with the proposed address to the Bishop of Lincoln. The form accompanying the address runs as follows:—

"To the Right Rev. the Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham.

"I beg you will be good enough to add my name to the above address to the Bishop of Lincoln.

"(Signed)."

G. E. W.

"*To the Right Reverend Father in God, Christopher, Lord Bishop of Lincoln.*

"We, the Archdeacons, Rural Deans, and Clergy of the Church of England, whose names are subscribed

desire to address your Lordship as our Spiritual Father, with feelings of deep gratitude on account of the strong opposition you have so ably made against the Burials Bill, now before Parliament, and for your earnest endeavours to protect the just rights of the Church of England with respect to her Churchyards.

"We wish to assure your Lordship that you have given utterance to our own feelings on this important subject, and especially as to your just protest against alterations in the law, permitting any persons to officiate at burials in our Churchyards, or in the consecrated portions of our cemeteries, other than our own Clergy.

"Thankful to God that we have a Bishop in the House of Lords, who has there truly and boldly represented us by using all his eloquence in the defence of our rights, we beg most respectfully to offer to your Lordship this tribute of our gratitude and thanks.

"June 25th, 1880."

—— : o : ——

SIR,—A great effort is now being made to accomplish the foundation of the See of Southwell. It is desirable for many reasons that the state of the case, as it now stands, should be widely known.

One great hindrance to the collection of the necessary funds, has been the widespread conviction that in consequence of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners having taken into their own hands all the revenues of the Colligiate Church of Southwell, that they should provide the funds required. This erroneous opinion has arisen from ignorance of the fact, that it is out of the power of that body to make a grant, as the disbursement of the revenues derived from that source has been already settled for them by Act of Parliament.

Another great obstacle is the agricultural depression, which has been especially felt in the Midland Counties. So that the £38,000, which is required, must depend, in a great measure, upon the support which is received from churchmen in general. A considerable period has elapsed since the Act was first passed, leaving only two years for the whole sum to be collected in. Various hinderances have prevented any united action having been taken hitherto, but now it is hoped that the time that has been lost may be made up by renewed and redoubled energy.

A proposition has been made, that those who wish to show their gratitude to the Bishop of Lincoln, for the noble stand which he made against the passing of the Burials Bill, should do so by contributing to a special fund which is being raised. Money has already been received, but much more is required to make the sum total in any way equal to such a sum as would represent the gratitude of the Church at large.

I would only add, that any sum will be gladly receive and acknowledged by either the Rev. C. W. MARKHAM, Saxby, Barton-on-Humber; or by myself.

ARTHUR F. SUTTON,
Hon. Sec. Notts Committee of the Southwell Bishopric Endowment Fund.

Southwell, Notts.

—— : o : ——

THE CLERGY AND THE BURIALS ACT.

SIR,—It would appear that it is proposed on the part of certain sections of the clergy to offer an oganized opposition to the working of the Burial Laws Amendment Act. Among other expedients for marking their sense of disatisfaction it has been suggested that they should refuse to register funerals conducted under the provisions of this Act.

That there should be a certain soreness in the matter was inevitable. No class is altogether exempt from profesional prepossessions; the sense of abated prerogative is hardly to be ranked among the pleasurable emotions; while the super-sensitiveness of advanced moral culture tends towards a somewhat morbid enlargement of the domain of conscience. The result is that men are now ripe for martyrdom on comparatively slight provocation, while the mode of martyrdom has mercifully adjusted itself to match the character of a refined and philanthropic era.

Still, it is devoutly to be hoped that this attempt at organized opposition to the expressed will of the nation in a matter, not of faith, but of discipline, will not pass beyond the stage of incubation. The true interests of the Church of England lie so plainly in the direction of extending and accentuating her national character that any measure which tends even unintentionally to establish this character should be welcomed by all who desire her continued prosperity. It is not by the retention of prerogative, but by the development of usefulness, that institutions are judged in the present day. By throwing open the graveyards to the nation the Church of England gives a fresh proof that she is a truly national Church, and brings the fact home to those who might else have never realized it. By the admission of Nonconformists themselves, the Church has of late years distanced all competitors in winning the affections of the people. At the recent Wesleyan Conference this was dwelt upon by several speakers, and regarded as the main explanation of the decreasing numbers of the Wesleyan body. In these circumstances, the admission of Nonconformists to the churchyards may prove perilous to themselves rather than to the Church. They may, as has been so often suggested, "through the churchyards make their way into the church;" but may it not be like Churchmen? At any rate, the more truly national the Church shows herself, the more is such a consummation brought within the range of possibility. Who will now venture to say that the Church is the worse for the abolition of compulsory church-rates? And if any Government, Whig or Tory, will but undertake the correction of the abuses still connected with patronage, the Church of England, purged of what Mr. Gladstone calls "her sins and her sores," would present the picture of a religious organization unequalled for usefulness among the Churches of the world—such an organization as no well-wisher of his country, whatever the special bias of his views, would willingly let die.

Kirkhallam, Derby. A. EUBULE-EVANS

—— : o : ——

EDUCATION IN TURKEY.

SIR,—I have perused with much interest a letter from Mr. Gavin Carlyle in *The Times* of to-day upon the educational work going on in Turkey. I would add my testimony to his, with your permission, particularly with respect to the valuable college and schools in Beyrout. The handsome buildings of the American Mission, called the Syrian Protestant College, are placed on an elevated and healthy site, and are not only an ornament to Beyrout, but a magnificent testimony to the self-sacrificing enterprise and perseverance of the great American Republic. The Rev. Dr. Bliss is the president of the college, and is supported by a distinguished staff of professors. There is a medical hall and literary department, with dormitories, cabinets, lecture and recitation rooms, library, and chapel. Adjoining these

is the refectory, with dining-hall and offices, &c. There is also an admirable geological museum. Each professor has his own department, and so well are the different faculties represented that the scholars have the advantages of a European collegiate training. The Lee Observatory, under the management of Dr. Van Dyck, supplies the college with a meteorological department. This has been patronized by the Turkish Government, and daily observations at their expense are telegraphed to the Imperial Observatory at Constantinople. The medical department is also in favour with the Sublime Porte, and, in consequence, it has been made a branch of the Imperial Medical College at Constantinople. Graduates from this Syrian Protestant College have also received appointments in the Turkish Army and the Civil Service. A course of study, extending over four years, is required of a student before he can graduate. The examinations are of the most searching character. The language of the college was Arabic, but is now giving way to English, and the course of instruction includes ancient and modern languages. It is almost impossible to over-estimate the advantages which will accrue to the people of Syria by the possession of native physicians, trained under the liberal and civilizing influences of modern science. The greatest enemies to missionary efforts are more than likely to be won over by the catholic spirit in which this establishment is founded and by the practical good it effects.

Of all the difficulties which missions have had to encounter in the East, the greatest has been to gain an influence over the softer sex—the mothers of the rising generation. A great deal in that direction is being done, notwithstanding; and Miss Taylor's excellent school for Moslem girls, situate on the Damascus-road, has the honourtof having given the first impulse to the movement in this direction. Nor must I forget to mention Mr. and Mrs. Mott's British Syrian Schools. They have twenty-four of these schools throughout Syria, half of which are located in Beyrout alone, and in them a thousand children are educated by forty-one native teachers. The Church of England, unfortunately, is not represented as it ought to be at Beyrout.

The tolerance which the Turkish Government shows to these educational efforts of a religion not their own is much to be commended, and does something to atone for its sins in other respects. There is only one nation which views with envy and dislike these educational agencies, and that nation is Holy Russia. Depend upon it, Sir, a little more energy on the part of the British public in propagating these benign principles would do no more for unhappy Turkey that all the "coercion" and "naval promenade concerts" in the in the world; and England is the only Power which is capable of undertaking the amelioration of the East. Trusting you will excuse this already too long intrusion upon your valuable space.

FREDERICK ARTHUR HYNDMAN.

3, Temple-gardens, September 15.

THE HEALTH OF LEICESTER.

SIR,—I observe in the *Times* of Thursday last a paragraph referring to the large number of deaths in the town from diarrhœa.

It is unfortunate that Leicester has for many years had an extremely high *infantile* mortality in the summer months, and the present year forms no exception.

About 75 per cent. of the deaths from diarrhœa for the last three weeks were children under twelve months old, and 95 per cent. under two years.

The disease is almost exclusively confined to infants, and but for the periodical high *infantile* mortality Leicester would rank among the healthiest towns in England.

I feel it my duty to call attention to these facts as large numbers of people are shortly expected here to attend the Church Congress, and some might be deterred if the paragraph in question were left unexplained.

WM. JOHNSTONE, M.D.,
Medical Officer of Health.

Town-hall, Leicester, September 20, 1880.

TEACHING IN SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

The Centenary of Sunday Schools has all but come and gone, and the question, "How can we make them more efficient?" has come to the surface for every one who is not utterly sceptical about their value. That there is in many places a deep-seated dissatisfaction with their present state, is a good sign, at any rate, and it has encouraged us to make some suggestions as to the way in which the teaching may be improved. But first let us be quite sure whose fault it is that the teaching is so inefficient as we allow it to be for the most part. It is the fault of the clergy. In most cases the only provision the clergy make for the teaching of the young who are not in the day school is the Sunday School, and they are as responsible for the teaching in the one as they are in the other. The Sunday School teachers are their deputies, and it is incumbent on the clergy to see that they do their work as well as possible. It is not as if the Sunday School teacher had an independent position assigned to him by the Church, if it were so we might be as little responsible for his efficiency as we are for the doings of the churchwarden who keeps the accounts. The teacher is the deputy of the pastor. Rightly or wrongly it has become customary for the clergy to entrust to others one of their most important functions, the teaching of the young; there is not a natural and independent right and obligation laid upon the teacher to do so—in other words he stands to the child *in loco pastoris*, not *in loco parentis*.

There is this additional reason why we shall take more trouble about the teaching. Our teachers are taken very largely (less so, perhaps, in Ireland than in England) from the middle and lower-middle classes of society. In the nature of things how superficial must be the knowledge of the young woman who left school at fifteen or sixteen, and who has been since that time, even eight or nine hours in the day, in the telegraph office, or in a dress-maker's shop, or in some other business, and even those who have had better opportunities of education, have probably never been trained in the art of communicating knowledge. They take so much trouble about their work for the most part that surely we ought to do our best to help them.

But what can we do to help them? Our own plan for some years past, both in England and in Ireland, has been to prepare a lesson each week somewhat in the manner of Stock's lessons, but shorter. Copies are made of this (in our school there was no difficulty about this, because the Sunday School Superintendent was a printer and he lithographed the thirty copies required, but the chromograph or the schmithotype will do them almost as well), one of these, which is the lesson for the next Sunday, is given to each teacher on Sunday morning, so that during the week he can consider the suggested line of instruction, look out the texts, and get it up. There is a teachers' class in the week, the

object of which is to give them some more general and deeper knowledge of the subject than perhaps they will actually require for their class; this class cannot be made simply a rehearsal of a Sunday School class, for though of course illustrations and ways of putting things may be suggested, it has always seemed to us unreal and practically impossible to treat a lot of grown-up men and women as if they were a class of children. On Sunday afternoon the children are catechized on the subject of the morning's lesson by the clergyman. If there is no afternoon school and no children's service, this catechization might take place in the morning school, which often in Dublin lasts for an hour—at least twenty minutes too long for a class on any subject. A plan adopted in a well-known Church school in Philiadelphia seems worth mentioning, but we cannot as yet speak of its value from experience. About four questions from some catechism with their answers are written out, a copy is given to each teacher, and they make their children learn by heart the answers, explaining them so far as they are able to understand them.

By adopting some such method as this, the person really is teaching his children himself. The truth that has come home to ourselves, the truth that we are best able to communicate to others percolates through to the youngest child—the Sunday School really prepares the children for confirmation classes, and there is a unity without sameness in the teaching. The plan spoken of here does of course involve a certain amount of labour, and after writing out a lesson every week for some years, one is tempted to let the teachers make out their lessons themselves from the books so plentifully provided for them, and if all of them have these books at hand, and are all able to come to the Bible class, it does not seem very necessary. The Bible class, and above all the catechizing, are the essential conditions of an efficient Sunday School. We do not at all wish to imply that it is only for the sake of what we can teach them that we get children to Sunday School. The moral influence of the teacher is quite as important and as valuable to the child as any instruction he is able to give, but it is their teaching and not their moral influence that has been most severely commented on of late, and we have made these suggestions because it is our conviction that *in its teaching* no Sunday School need be a failure where its clergy are not inefficient.—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

The London correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury* makes the announcement that the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, one of the chaplains in ordinary to the Queen and minister of Bedford Chapel, Bloomsbury, is about to leave the Church of England. "Since the death of Canon Kingsley, Mr. Brooke has been the hope of his party in the Church. The biographer of Robertson of Brighton, a disciple in some respects of Professor Maurice, he held as long as he could to the ideal of a comprehensive Church, including all parties; and while rejecting as utterly untenable the dry orthodox doctrines of future punishment, substitutionalism, and verbal inspiration, yet maintained the Divinity of Christ and the truth, 'if properly understood,' of the three Creeds. For a long time his followers have been conscious of doubt and hesitancy in his preaching. You had an outline only a few weeks ago of a sermon in which he begged his congregation to wait awhile in the Jerusalem of their hearts until the revelation of the new Pentecost had come. The purely humanitarian side of Christianity has been more and more apparent in his sermons. For him Dean Stanley may have written that explanation of Trinitarianism which, when it appeared the other day in the *Nineteenth Century*, caused so much commotion among the orthodox. All in vain. Mr. Brooke has become a Unitarian. He will reform the Prayer-book *à la* Voysey, and use hymns henceforth without the ascription; preaching sermons which, instead of inculcating the worship of Christ, will deprecate it as idolatry. The Unitarians have long been without a successor to Mr. Martineau, as a really eloquent preacher, with wide literary sympathies and not without some yearnings towards the communion he has left, Mr. Brooke will fill that place. But the pain he will cause among his most fervent admirers is only a portion of the harm that his secession will cause. Probably one-half of those who have been influenced by his teaching have felt, as Mr. Maurice did when he ceased to be a Unitarian, that there was no explanation possible of the mystery of existence unless the revelation of the Gospel was Divine. To them, the only alternatives are some form of Trinitarianism and simple agnosticism—the knowledge of nothing. To these, his disciples, the tearing away of their only standing ground will bring such confusion and sorrow as only those people can understand who have themselves felt the pangs which follow upon a surrender of the creed of their active life."

The arrangements for the Leicester Church Congress, which is to begin on Tuesday next, are now complete. A large hall capable of seating between three and four thousand persons has been erected close to the railway-station. It is internally an extremely fine building, and is pronounced by good judges to be acoustically excellent. Within five minutes' walk is the Temperance Hall, capable of seating about fifteen hundred persons, where most of the sectional meetings will be held. A few of the sectional meetings, however, will be held in the Lecture-hall of the Town Museum, a room which will seat between five and six hundred persons, and situated within a short distance of the other two places of meeting. The County Assembly-room will be fitted up as a reading and writing room, and the committees of the Leicestershire Club and of the General Newsroom have made holders of Congress members' tickets honorary members of these institutions for the week. A large amount of hospitality is offered by the residents of the town and neighbourhood—Nonconformists vying with Churchmen in giving invitations. The committee have, moreover, a list of nearly eight hundred beds to be had as lodgings, besides those provided by hotels. Special arrangements have been made for meals, from breakfast to supper, to be had at convenient centres at a fixed tariff. The Midland and London and North-Western Railway Companies have arranged to run special morning and evening trains between Leicester and the neighbouring towns, at hours convenient for the Congress during its session. The Mayor, Mr. John Bennett, has hospitably invited the members to a *conversazione* to be held at the Town Museum at the close of the proceedings. The President and Council of the English Church Union have issued a circular impressing on the members the importance of attending in large numbers. There will be daily celebration at St. Paul's, at 7.15, and at St. George's at eight. A conference of members, and friends introduced by them, will be held on Monday evening at Peel-street Chapel, at which the chair will be taken by the President, the Hon. C. L. Wood, who will propose the following resolution:—"That it is desirable that a special meeting of the Union be held in London in November for the purpose of considering the advice which should be tendered to the clergy in regard to their action under the altered state of the Burial laws."

A meeting of the Young Men's Friendly Society will be held in the Masonic Hall, Leicester, on Wednesday, at 4.30 p.m., Lord Brabazon in the chair. The Bishop of Truro will preach at St. Matthew's on Wednesday evening for his Cathedral Building Fund.

A Public Meeting will be held at the Temperance Hall, on Monday evening the 27th September, at 8 o'clock, under the auspices of the Free and Open Church Association, and the chair will be taken by the Earl Nelson, when the following resolutions will be proposed :—(1) "That all Parishioners, without respect to class, have an equal right to the free use of their Parish Churches, and that the Pew System, under which seats are permanently appropriated to individuals to the exclusion of the many, is opposed alike to Scriptural precept, to the law of the Church, and to the spiritual requirements of the people." (2) "That every Church should be open and free of access to all at all times, as a House of Prayer, especially for the use of those living in crowded neighbourhoods who have little opportunity for privacy in their own homes." (3) "That the Weekly Offertory, especially enjoined by the Church in accordance with Scriptural injunctions, is the most fitting means of providing for the expenses of Divine Worship, and for other "pious and charitable uses," inasmuch as it enables every one to give according to his means as "an offering unto the Lord," instead of limiting the contributions to fixed payments by the few for the enjoyment of exclusive privileges."

Colonel Joicey, M.P. for North Durham, has signified his intention of giving £2,000 to the Newcastle Bishopric Fund.

The Lord Chancellor has exchanged with the Bishop of London the rectory of St. Giles's-in-the-Fields for the vicarage of Bedfont, near Staines. The rectory of St. Giles is stated to have a gross income of £718, without a house, with a population in 1871 of 35,703 souls ; while the vicarage of Bedfont has an annual income of £508, with a house, with a population in 1871 of 1,288 souls.

Special sermons were preached in York Minster on Sunday for the Seaham Relief Fund. The Dean occupied the pulpit in the morning, and Canon Fleming in the afternoon, the choir being densely crowded at both services. This autumn a new arrangement of Sunday services has been made at York; formerly the afternoon service consisted of the Litany, followed by the usual choral evensong; now a short sermon is preached, and the first service begins at three instead of four. A harvest festival is to be held in York Minster on the afternoon of Saturday week, when Canon Fleming is to preach, and the offertory is to be given to the York County Hospital.

The Rev. Thomas Boys, of Hoxton, who died last week, was an indefatigable writer and a profound classical student. Sir George Cornwall-Lewis expressed his warm admiration for many of his editions of classical authors, some of them being still used at Cambridge. Mr. Boys was a regular contributor to "Blackwood's Magazine" for some fifty years, and several of the best tales that have appeared in "Maga" were from his fertile pen. He was also a frequent writer in the congenial pages of "Notes and Queries." His knowledge of early English literature was truly remarkable, considering his many other accomplishments. Mr. Boys went through the Peninsular War, being then employed as an army chaplain.

Kirby-Malzeard Church, which is one of the oldest and most intereuting churches in Yorkshire, being the "mother church" of the district which includes Fountains Abbey, has just been elaborately restored by Mr. A. W. Blomfield, all the original features of the building being preserved. A large part of the cost has been borne by Trinity College, Cambridge, the patrons. A beautiful stained glass window has been erected to the memory of Mrs. Danby-Vernon-Harcourt, of Swinton Park. The Bishop of Ripon re-opened the church last week.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. W., vicar of Walsall, prebendary of Lichfield Cathedral.
Bourdillon, Rev. Francis, vicar of Old Warden.
Brandreth, Rev. William, curate of Addington, Surrey; vicar of St. Gregory-the-Great, Canterbury.
Burt, Rev. John Thomas, rector of Southwick.
Colbeck, Rev. W. R., rural dean of Hoxne.
Cook, Rev. Thomas Henry, vicar of Helme.
Cooper, Rev. L. L., vicar of St. John's, Leicester.
Curteis, Rev. George Herbert, rector of Waldron.
Eyre, Rev. John R., incumbent of St. Luke's, Liverpool; minister of St. Michael's, Toxteth Park, Liverpool.
Fuller, Rev. Henry, vicar of Milton Ernest, Beds.
Gilbert, Rev. Edward Wiles, vicar of Falinge; rector of Wenden Lofts-with-Elmdon.
Gregson, Rev. Jesse, vicar of Rusland, Lancashire.
Harris, Rev. John Oliver, rector of West Walton-with-Talbenny, Pembrokeshire.
Hawkins, Rev. William Webster, vicar of Hensall-cum-Heck.
Heald, Rev. Charles William, perpetual curate of Bobbington.
Holden, Rev. H. B. M. M., vicar of St. Bartholomew, Bowling, Bradford.
Kennedy, Rev. J. D., rector of St. Sampson, Guernsey, rector of Grazeley.
Lake, Rev. Walter James, vicar of Farnley; incumbent of Clayton-le-Moors.
Le Feuvre, Rev. P. A., curate-in-charge of St. Heliers; acting chaplain to the Forces at Jersey.
Mallinder, Rev. Dacre, perpetual curate of Bolton-on-Swale.
McArthur, Rev. Charles Chapman, rector of Burlingham St. Andrew and St. Peter, Norfolk.
Miller, Rev. John Lacy, rector of Hackford, Norfolk.
Molony, Rev. Charles Walker, rector of West Worlington.
Norman, Rev. Robert Manners, vicar of Maltby.
Norris, Rev. Charles Edward, rector of Wenden Lofts-with-Elmdon; vicar of Farlinge.
Parish, Rev. William Samuel, vicar of Freckenham.
Parker, Rev. Charles William, vicar of Downton-on-the-Rock, Ludlow.
Pickford, Rev. John, vicar of Tuddenham St. Martin, Suffolk.
Seaver, Rev. J., senior curate of Cheltenham; vicar of Cullercoats, near Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Whitehead, Rev. George, vicar of Ellington.
Williams, Rev. Hugh George, vicar of Radyr, Glamorganshire.
Wood, Rev. Charles Robert, vicar of Bredfield with Lowdham-cum-Pettistree, Suffolk.
Wren, Rev. Thomas Bishop Cawley, rector of Corney, Cumberland.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Seymour, Rev. Sir John Hobart Culme, Bart, at the Cloisters, Gloucester, on the 17th inst., aged 80.
Shepherd, Rev. W., forty-six years vicar of the parish, at the vicarage, Bolton-in-Morland, on the 17th inst., aged 77.
Smith, Rev. James Newland, M.A., suddenly, at Maze-hill School, Greenwich-park, on the 15th inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE USE OF DOGMA IN RELIGION.

By the Hon. and Rev. A. T. LYTTELTON, M.A.,
Warden of Selwyn College, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday Evening, August 1st, 1880.

"And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."—John xvii 3.

FEW things are more conspicuous in the religious life of our time than the tendency to reject theology, dogma, creeds, and confessions of faith as unnecessary to religion, and injurious to the freedom and delicacy of devotion. This is not the case only with those who disbelieve the dogmas they are trying to abolish, for that would be natural and inevitable, but we see Christians who profess a belief in the Articles of the Faith, and who yet lay no stress upon positive doctrine, find in it no help in their spiritual life, and would gladly if they could leave it out of sight altogether. They wish to cultivate religious emotions, they wish to pray, they wish to have their hearts uplifted by thanksgiving to God, but they are impatient of the intellectual side of religion, they do not see how it fits into the rest, they cannot make it harmonize with their idea of worship, which is purely emotional. I suppose we all feel in some degree the force of this tendency; we all understand what it is to shrink from the very name of dogma, and to turn, as we think, to the pure and elevating emotions of love, hope, trust, which seem to constitute the essence of religion. When one school of theologians makes the whole of religion to consist in the sense of dependence, and another finds that all Christianity is summed up in the word "love," it is evident that there is a danger of the Catholic Faith losing its finely proportioned organisation, its delicately articulated system of independent truths, and becoming a formless succession of vague emotions. If this dislike of dogma continues to grow, we must look forward to a complete change in our religious life; for nothing can be more certain than that for eighteen centuries Christianity has been a Faith in certain truths, the Church has been an organization depending upon that Faith, and held together by a common belief; worship has been the common relation of believers to the God whom the intellect as well as the heart revealed to man. I do not believe that such a change is compatible with the continued existence of Christianity; and I wish to consider what doctrine really is, and how it is practically important in the religious life of man.

When men talk of dogma, and object to it that it prevents or at least does not help the religious emotion, and prefer, even while assenting to it, to leave it on one side and cultivate their feelings only, they forget two things. First they forget that, whatever they may say or think, these doctrines are true, and truth cannot be shunned or overlooked with impunity. We may not pick and choose what we shall believe, what we shall study, what we shall worship. The Christian Faith is not a mere casual collection of unconnected truths, some of which we may take and some reject; nor is it a mere feeling of trust which we may indulge in while disregarding the truths upon which it rests. It is a system, an organic whole in which each truth is connected with the rest, so that to leave out one is to weaken and distort and falsify the others: and it is a system which supplies the emotions, and without which they must infallibly die out like a fire without fuel. Men have too often arrogated the right of setting themselves above truth, not confining themselves to the lawful human task of judging whether a thing be true or not, but choosing from out of the mass of truths certain favourites which they take as their servants, the ministers of their pride, and of their indolence, or of their sentimentality. Truth is to them not a master but a slave; they divide it, and reject it, and disregard it, not because it is false, but because they do not like it, and they believe they can do without it. You will see that I am only addressing those who do believe the Christian system, but do not care for remembering their belief; not those who are not believers at all. If you are Christians you must take upon you the full responsibility of your faith: you must commit yourselves unreservedly into the hands of truth, you must bow to it as your ruler and your master, because before its majestic and calm strength sooner or later you will have to confess yourself helpless and crushed; every jot and tittle must then be accepted, if not with a joyous and long expected recognition, then with a fear and shrinking, as it is said "the devils also believe and tremble." And why is it that dogmatic truth has this organic nature, that every part of it is connected with the whole? and why is it thus dominant and authoritative? Is it not, and this is the second fact that men forget, because Christian doctrine is the revelation of the character of God? All those truths that we now call abstract and unpractical, the doctrines of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Atonement, are not these wonderful manifestations of God's Nature? Even the less strictly theological truths of the Christian system, the Catholic teaching of Justification by Faith, of Grace, and Freewill, of the Fall of Man, of Final Punishment, are all, if you will consider them, declarations of some aspect of God's character towards us, of His Love, His Mercy or His Justice, descriptions, as far as man can describe, of His Person by just the same method as that by which we get to know a fellow-creature, viz., by his actions. Dogmatic religion is a systematic account of God's actions, and, in one mysterious truth, of His Nature as He is in Himself, apart

from us. The Articles of the Creed, the definitions of the Catechism, what are they but the various fragments of the infinite reality that man has been allowed to gather, "broken lights" it may be, but "broken lights of Thee," and therefore "our little systems" do not "have their day and cease to be," because being rays of the Eternal and Unchangeable they also like their source "are the same and their years shall not fail." "Heaven and earth shall pass away but My word shall not pass away."

And this shows why dogmatic truth is an organic whole, an indissoluble unity. Religious truth is one because it is the description of the character of a person; and just as you cannot take some only of your friend's qualities and call them the whole man, for you cannot tell how much each one of the numberless peculiarities contributes to the total impression which makes the character of your friend, so we dare not disregard the smallest detail of Christian truth, for we know not what previous glimpse into the eternal beauty we may not thereby be losing. A character, a person, is a unity, not a mere collection of qualities. God is not righteousness, and justice, and love, but a righteous, and a just, and a loving person; and to leave out any part of the system of doctrine which embodies our knowledge of His character is to obliterate that knowledge and to distort that character. And still more to give up all our knowledge altogether, to turn from truth and make religion only an emotion, is to keep to childish things and refuse to employ man's privilege of knowledge based on experience. Because a child loves his father with a vague and imperfect and unreasoning, though real love, is he therefore, as he grows older, to reject all those glad perceptions of his father's character, those sudden acquisitions of knowledge about him, those slow accumulations of experience of his love and his goodness, which manhood, with its increasing power of reason, adds to the blind emotions of the child? Are we to turn back to the vague feelings of awe and terror, of intermittent love and unreasoning trust which form the religion of the savage, now that the experience of the manhood of our race has given us a rational comprehension of some part of God's character? Yes, we are children, and ignorant children, but we have the power of growth, we have the faculty of reason expanding as the race advances, we are older than our forefathers, we may claim to know more of God than they did, because we come after them, and, above all, because one part of our experience has been the clear and definite revelation of God in Christ Jesus. That is the inalienable heritage of the Christian world. He came in the "fulness of time," in order that the human race should pass from childhood into manhood, that He might add to their emotions of fear and love the certain rational knowledg of God our Father. The revelation of God as a Father was the special object of our Lord's teaching; and those who dislike dogmatic truth should remember that what we call dogma is almost all based upon Jesus Christ's manifestation of the Father, in His teaching and in His life. It was this knowledge thus imparted to man that raised him from childhood to manhood; this "power to become the sons of God" was gained for us by the life and death of Christ, and was a power founded upon the knowledge of a dogmatic truth, viz., that God is our Father. From that knowledge we cannot go back, we cannot renounce our heritage; for though it is true that "knowledge shall vanish away," yet it is only to be succeeded by further knowledge, for "when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." The growth of the human mind from lesser to fuller knowledge of God, is represented by St. Paul as a passage from childhood into manhood; the starting point is the mere vague emotional faith of a child, the final end is the full and certain and rational knowledge, "when we shall know even as we are known." This is Christian dogma. It is the working out by the reason of man, of those Divine truths concerning God's character which were revealed to us in and by Jesus Christ—"putting away childish things," the shrinking obedience of the Jew, only doubtfully venturing to hope that God was his Father, the blind fear and trust of the heathen, we passed into manhood because God held us to be worthy of having fuller truth entrusted to us, and sent us His Son, that by seeing Him we might see the Father, that He might manifest God's Name unto those who should believe in Him. If this is the history of dogma, who are we that we should disregard it? Why should we, "upon whom the ends of the world are come," think that this is the time to go back to a mere feeling of dependence or of love? Are we to give up the experience of centuries, springing from Christ's revelation of God's character, and to build our house upon a foundation more doubtful than the sand? We may, indeed, examine our dogmas, question them, give up boldly what seems to us false, but we dare not say that what is true is indifferent, or that knowledge of God's character can ever give place to emotions, however exalted.

What then is the practical use of dogma? How can we in our daily religious life make it serve our spiritual requirements? Perhaps many here remember the beautiful mediæval legend of the holy monk whose one fault, as he meditated in his cloister, was a doubt whether heaven could afford joys enough to fill eternity, whether any joy could last for ever. Then one day he wandered into a wood, and suddenly heard in a secluded grove a bird singing more beautifully than any he had ever heard before. So he sat and listened, and listened with ever-increasing wonder and delight, till, when it ceased, he found he had stayed, as he thought, many hours. But when he returned to his monastery he could recognise no one, all the faces were new; nor did they know him. At last he found out that while he had been entranced in the song of the bird a whole century had passed over him

unconsciously, so deep was the delight. And soon he died; and, as a fine poet of our own day has described it, while he lay dying, his one fear was

> Lest an eternity should not suffice
> To take the measure and the breadth and height,
> Of what there is reserved in Paradise—
> Its ever-new delight.

The meaning of this beautiful legend is clear. It tells us that eternal life is the rapture of possessing a perfect object; that all sense of the flight of time will be lost in a great delight. But what is that delight? How will eternity be filled? "This is eternal life, that they should know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." Eternal life will be the rapt contemplation of the perfection of that Divine truth which here we have foreshadowed to us "through a glass darkly" in dogmatic and theological definitions and descriptions. The discovery of "new depths of the Divine," fresh acquisitions of the truth which is the purest beauty, will be the occupation of heaven. But this has already begun: "this *is* eternal life." Does not the passage mean that a clear knowledge of God's character, a perception, however attained, of the endless majesty and beauty of His infinity, enables us, even here, to conquer time, and to partake already of eternity? The contemplation and the discovery of truth are, we know, means whereby men have often raised themselves above the "changes and chances of this mortal life," and become unconscious of the flight of time. And if this is the case with any truth, how much more when it is a truth which leads us directly to the Throne of God, to the sanctuary of eternity itself. Religious doctrine is thus the God-appointed means of contemplating God. Use it for this: use it as an escape from the endless self-contemplation of our time; cling to it as a refuge from the feelings and emotions which however they are excited never fail at last to centre in ourselves. Emotions are the fruit of knowledge; if our knowledge is only of ourselves, our emotions must be selfish. And so much religion in our time is self-centred, so much even of our prayers and of our worship is taken up with recounting our own experiences, and our own troubles, testing and trying our feelings and our passions and our own hidden thoughts, that it is necessary to recall ourselves to the use of theological truth as a grandly unselfish thing, a path which leads us away from ourselves to "set us upon the Rock that is higher than we," and thereby to give us the profound peace of entranced veneration. To some minds there is no part of our public worship so joyful so profoundly satisfying and restful as the great declarations of dogmatic truths which are contained in the Creeds. There is treasured up for us the Church's experience of God's character, there we learn to know God: we are taken out of ourselves, our eyes are turned to the Fountain of light, and the selfishness of individual feelings is lost in the common contemplation of an Infinite object. This is the use of religious dogma: it enables us to know God, and the knowledge of God is Eternal Life. How much that knowledge will be increased and deepened and widened hereafter, none can say; but we know that whatever we learn of His character in Heaven, will be but a continuation of what we have began to learn here on earth; and the same contemplation which even now makes us triumph over time, will, when undimmed by the "muddy vesture of decay" which "doth grossly close us in," be the unceasing delight of an eternity which cannot exhaust the Infinite Beauty of Eternal Truth. This then is Eternal Life, to know God; and this was the gift of Jesus Christ when He gave us power to become the sons of God, and therefore, and not because of any emotions of ours, have we hope for the life which is to come. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is."

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1880.

LEICESTER CHURCH CONGRESS.

BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH'S ADDRESS.

The first duty of the President of a Church Congress is to offer it, on behalf of the diocese in which it assembles and of the town to which it has been invited, a cordial welcome. As regards this diocese, I can testify that the desire to receive you has been long entertained, and has been more than once pressed upon its Bishop, who, if he hesitated for some time to comply with that wish, desires now to join heartily for himself in that welcome which he tenders you on behalf of others. As regards the town of Leicester, I am happy to know that willingness to receive you is not confined to the Churchmen amongst its inhabitants. When I say that the Mayor of this town, himself a decided and consistent Nonconformist, has volunteered to be our host at the entertainment which is to conclude our proceedings, and has from the first consented to take his place on our reception committee, and when I add that Nonconformist hospitality has been liberally and readily placed at the disposal of that committee, I think that I may venture to say to you on behalf, not only of the Churchmen of this town, but of many who are not Churchmen, "Welcome to Leicester!" My next duty, and it is one that I perform with great pleasure, is to invite—may I not say to convey—the expression of your thanks to the distinguished preachers who have this day addressed us in sermons of which I will only venture, in their presence, to say that they were worthy alike of the preachers and of the occasion. And now, having discharged these my first duties as your

President, it remains for me to find words which should aim at setting before you and myself the true purpose and idea of our meeting, to which we should endeavour to conform, and strive to promote. And in doing this I will (I hope with your approval) omit to speak of one supposed great object and result of Church Congresses. I mean the promoting of tolerance and charity amongst Churchmen by bringing together members of all parties of the Church, and training them first to endure and then to esteem each other. I will not speak of this, because I am a little tired, and even a little ashamed, of hearing it made so much of on these occasions. It is not altogether to our credit that the President of each Church Congress should commence it by half-nervous assurances of his confidence in the Christian charity of the assembly—or that he should conclude it by congratulations on the fact that a number of brother clergymen have met together for four days, and have actually kept the peace! It is really time, I think, that we should take all this for granted; that we should assume, once for all, that Churchmen know how to behave themselves as well as other people, and that they have learned long since to own and to esteem all that is good in those from whom they most widely differ. Setting aside, then, this somewhat worn-out plea for Church Congresses, let us try if we can find any better reason than this for their existence. Now, it seems to me, on looking back over a period of twenty years, to the time and the circumstances of the origin of Church Congresses, that they were an attempt—necessarily an imperfect, and perhaps, a partly unconscious attempt—to meet what was then a great need and a great desire of the Church. I mean the need and the desire for some general and representative assembly of Churchmen—some assembly in which Churchmen of all orders and ranks, of all schools of thought, might unite together on the one broad basis of their common Churchmanship, to confer upon the affairs of their Church. The need and the desire for such an assembly, and the attempt to satisfy them, were the natural and necessary outcome of that great revival of our Church's life for which the earlier part of this century will ever be memorable in her history. As that great religious movement spread itself widely and deeply through the Church, stirring it all over with fresh impulses as the rising sap stirs bark and bough and bud after their long winter sleep—it carried with it, as a part of its motive and vivifying power, a truer and a higher conception of the Church than had long prevailed. Churchmen began everywhere to conceive of the Church no longer as an ecclesiastical corporation into which men entered by ordination, but as a divine family into which men were admitted by baptism, no longer as a mere department of the State, but as part of a kingdom older and mightier than any State, a kingdom which has survived and will survive many States, a kingdom having its own conditions of citizenship, its own laws, its own forms and conditions of life. But, as men became thoroughly conscious of this, the necessary result was a desire for some mode in which the corporate life of the Church should express and manifest itself, should guide and order its own course. In cherishing and in obeying such a desire—in seeking the revival of those public assemblies which were a part of her original constitution, and to the gathering together of which in His name Her Master has promised the blessing of His Divine presence—the Church was only, like all other living things, developing her life in accordance with its own inherent and necessary laws. This feeling first took outward shape in the revival of Convocation. But it soon became manifest that Convocation could not completely satisfy this need of the Church; and for this reason—that while on the one hand, Convocation represented only the clergy, on the other hand, a great change had passed, during its abeyance, over the great council of the nation, which at one time might have been regarded, and indeed was regarded, as representing the laity of the Church. Parliament—which at one time in its history was virtually a lay Convocation—had long ceased to be an assembly exclusively of Churchmen; it had even ceased, or was just then ceasing to be, an assembly exclusively of Christians. When, therefore, the time for the revival of Church Councils had come, some place had to be found, under these altered conditions, for the representation of the laity, and that, too, in their distinctive character as members of the Church, and not, as heretofore, as members of the nation. Now it appears to me that Church Congresses, in their constitution and idea, were an attempt to find such a place for the laity. Certainly they first gave to the laity an equal place with the clergy in a Church conference, and they seemed, moreover, to have aimed from the first at giving to each congress a representative character; not representative by election, for which the Church was not then ripe, but representative at least by selection, the principle acted on from the first by congress committees being that, so far as regarded its selected elements, the Congress should, as much as possible, present that aspect which it would present if freely elected by the Church at large. Add to this the fact that *bonâ fide* membership is the Church is a condition of membership in the Congress; and, further, that it must be presided over by the Bishop of the diocese in which it assembles, and you will see, I think, that the Church Congress from the first was something more than a mere chance-medley of persons interested in Church matters—a mere fortuitous concourse of Church atoms—and that it has always exhibited the distinct, even if rudimentary, outlines of those mixed and representative assemblies of clergy and laity which are becoming, under the conditions of modern political and ecclesiastical life, the form of which Church corporate life is necessarily and instinctively shaping itself. But these elements being, as I have said but imperfectly present in Church Congresses, it is clear that these labour under considerable disadvantages, and are exposed to dangers from which other assemblies are free. For instance, not being in any way legislative their discussions are not steadied and weighted by the sense of responsiblility attaching to words which may become laws; and further, as the subjects for discussion do not arise spontaneously from the necessities of legislation, there is the obvious temptation to select, not those which are solid and important, even if unattractive, but rather those that are telling and popular, and which will draw speakers and an audience. Again, these congresses not being truly and perfectly representative, they are not only an imperfect test of Church feeling and opinion, but they are actually in danger of becoming an untrue test, inasmuch as sense of fairness induces each committee to aim at giving to all schools in the Church an equal representation in our debates, which, as all schools in the Church are not equal in numbers or importance, must be so far a misleading representation. And inasmuch as the congress is not, properly speaking, a deliberative assembly—does not, that is to say, come to any decision directly upon any question discussed by it—there is the obvious temptation to come at this decision indirectly, if not by votes, by voices; by the volume of sound which

greets the appearance of some party leader, or the cheers which follow the utterance of some party watchword, as each party in turn tries thus to elicit what may appear in the papers as the "feeling of the congress," forgetting that after all, shouting proves nothing except the strength of the lungs of the shouters. In one word, the dangers of Church Congresses are manifestly these—that in numbers they may prove unwieldy; in choice of snbjects limited; in discussion rhetorical and declamatory; in general result unpractical. Now, if this be so, it may be asked, and, indeed, it is being asked by many, whether Congresses, having done their work in the past, might not give place to those other Church assemblies, the formation of which they have doubtless largely stimulated. If I were asked why this is not yet so—if I were asked to explain the fact of the continuance of such assemblies as we see here to day—I should venture to interpret it as meaning this—that the desire and the need which Congresses first sought to meet are not yet all fulfilled. Our ruridecanal, our diocesan conferences, excellent as they are, are still local; they are not yet even provincial. They cannot, therefore, claim to speak for the whole Church. There is yet to be evolved out of them, and there are, I think, signs that there will yet be evolved out of them, by a process of natural growth and selection, some central and general assembly, representative, deliberative—entitled to speak for the whole Church, with all the weight of its representative character—a body to which may yet be intrusted within due and reasonable limits, some such power of self-regulation, of local control, as Parliament seems increasingly disposed to grant to other institutions not more desirous nor more deserving of it than the Church of England. That some such central and general assembly of the Church of England will yet be the completion of her present growth of representative institutions, seems to me as certain as any event in the future can be. That when it does come it will bring its own defects and dangers is quite certain. He must be a careless student of Church history, who believes that the Church councils are a panacea for all Church difficulties. But of this, nevertheless, I am persuaded, that some such uniting, moderating, central assembly of the Church is all but a necessity, if she is to hold her own amidst many rivals, who, though inferior to her in numbers, are yet superior to her in this, that they are, what she was, yet is not, thoroughly and completely organised, whether for work, for reform, or for defence. Meanwhile Church Congresses may have their work to do, if it were only to keep before men's minds, the idea of some such central and general assembly as still an unfulfilled desideratum of the Church. And meanwhile if I may venture upon a word of counsel, it would be that Congresses should carefully avoid those dangers to which they are liable and of which I have spoken; and they will, I think, best do this by aiming as much as possible at giving to their proceedings a strictly practical character, both as regards the subjects they discuss and the manner of their discussion; that they should aim mainly at being conferences of Church workers simply desirous of conferring together as to the best means of doing the Church's work. This I can testify has certainly been the aim which the committee of this Leicester Congress has steadily set before itself. Desired that our Congress should be a review of the progress and the methods of Church work in all its various departments. In a word, the idea of our Congress, if I may venture to speak for it, is this—the Church of England for her Master's sake, the servant of the English nation. We are here to discover, if we may, what hindrances she still meets with, what helps she may devise, in the performance of her great task. And this desire to be practical will account for the omission from our list of subjects or sonc of what are called the "burning Church questions" of our time. If these do not appear in our programme it is not because we were afraid of them; but simply because they were crowded out by subjects which seemed to us at once more important and more practical. For burning questions are not always important ones, sometimes they are even pitifully small and unimportant. They have, for the most part, I think, a happy way of burning themselves out if you let them alone. Are we not walking now, over the ashes of more than one once burning, and now burnt out, question? No! The really great and urgent questions of the day are far other and weightier than these. While we have been disputing about details of ceremony and modes of worship, the world around us has been discussing whether there is any use or meaning whatever in our worship or in the faith that it expresses. The one great Church question of our time, before which all others fade into insignificance, is this. Round about church and chapel, impartially indifferent or impartially hostile to both, lie the masses of our great town populations, the scattered units in our country parishes, for whom life has no higher, no better meaning than that of a daily struggle for the means of a joyless existence, uncheered by the hope of a happier hereafter, undignified by the consciousness of Divine descent and heirship of immortality. What can the Chnrch of England do for these? Here, believe me, lies the one supremely urgent question for which we have to find an answer, and that speedily. And in the answer to this question, if she can find it, lies, not only the secret of the Church's duty, but the secret also of her strength and her security. The Church of England has been learning of late the lesson—has she at last fully learnt it? well for her if she has—not to "put her trust in princes." Not in the favour of statesmen, not in the adheson of nor in her adhesion to this or that party in the State, not in trying to obtain from the timid friendship of one set of politicians, or from the contemptuous patronage of another, a defence against the inveterate hostility of a third, will her security be found—but in the hearts of the people, in the affections of the multitude whom her Master is calling her to win and save for Him. It is to learn how far she is doing this, and how she may do it in the future, we are gathered here to-day. Our Church Congresses may pass away and give place to other machinery: our methods of Church work may grow, and change in their growth for other and better appliances; but, after all, it is the spirit and heart of the workers that tell most in all work for God. Those who succeed us, and who enter into our labours, will doubtless see much in our work that was faulty—will learn from our failures, profit by our mistakes. But this, at least, it is in our power to ensure—that they shall say of this generation of Churchmen that, with all its imperfections, all its faults, it was one that strove honestly and manfully to understand and to grapple with the evils and the dangers of its day; one that, spite of many failures in other things, did at least succeed in this, that it handed on to the age that succeeded it, not this or that pattern of Church work, but the true spirit of the workers—a spirit of courageous faith, of resolute self-denial, of patient continuance in well-doing.

DURHAM DIOCESAN CONFERENCE.

The first Durham Diocesan Conference began on September 21st, when Bishop Lightfoot delivered the following inaugural address :—

" Brother Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Durham —I am sure that at this moment one feeling must be uppermost in the minds of all present—a heartfelt sense of thanksgiving to Almighty God that we are permitted thus to meet together. A generation ago a Diocesan Conference was a thing altogether unknown in our English Church. Now there are few dioceses which have not their periodical gatherings, where representatives of the laity, as well as the clergy, meet together to discuss matters affecting the welfare of the Church. This is not the least happy result of the revived life and energy in the Church of England. In this respect the diocese of Durham has been late in the field. The zeal and devotion, the business capacities, and the untiring energy of my predecessor were fitly expended on the internal work of the diocese. In addition to the current duties of the Episcopate—an ever-increasing burden in a large and growing diocese like this—it was his special work to develop the parochial system by the formation of new districts, by the building of churches and parsonages, and by the increase of the clerical staff. His Episcopate coincided with an exceptional crisis in the history of the diocese—exceptional alike whether we regard the exigencies or the opportunities of the Church in these northern counties. It was a crisis as regards the exigencies, for the rapid development of the industries—more especially of the mineral industries—in these parts had produced a corresponding increase in the population, so much so that during the twenty years from 1851 to 1871—the two decades which fall immediately before and after Bishop Baring's accession to office—the population of the county of Durham nearly doubled itself, rising from 391,000 in 1851 to 685,000 in 1871. The banks of the Tyne, the Wear, and the Tees furnish the most striking examples of this rapid increase, but everywhere the phenomena are the same. A recent notice in the obituary reminded us that one of the largest and most thriving towns in the country was the creation of half a lifetime. One who died only the other day was already approaching middle age when West Hartlepool was still a rabbit-warren. And this is only a type of what has happened again and again throughout great parts of the diocese, though not on so large a scale. A shaft is sunk, and immediately houses spring up about it by scores and by hundreds. A pit village is created—a village we call it, by a gentle irony, though it vomits forth dense clouds of smoke, and before it is two years old it outnumbers n population not a few country towns in more southern and sunny regions. But, happily, this crisis of emergency was likewise, as I said before, a crisis of opportunity. When Bishop Baring's Episcopate commenced the Local Claims Act had recently been passed—that righteous measure which provided that at least a reasonable proportion of the large ecclesiastical revenues derived from the diocese of Durham should go towards providing the urgent spiritual needs of the localities from which they were drawn. It was his special task to put this act into operation—with what beneficent results I need not say, for they are well known to all. In his last Charge, delivered a few months before his resignation, Bishop Baring expressed his opinion that this particular work, the formation of new ecclesiastical districts, had also reached its limits. This may be so; though as yet I see no signs of flagging. But, whatever remains to be done by his successors, this was the distinguishing characteristic of his Episcopate. With his hands so fully occupied, we cannot feel surprise that he should leave to others a work which seemed less pressing. But a Church is something more than an aggregate of district parishes or isolated congregations. The idea of a Church involves the conception of a corporate life. A Church is only a Church in so far as it realises this conception. To extend the sympathies and motives of common membership beyond the limits of the parish to the limits of the diocese is to make an important stride in the realisation of this idea. It seemed to me that the time was ripe for taking this step. It was the proper sequel to Bishop Baring's work. Moreover, there are forces operating which render it more than ever advisable that the Church of England should habituate herself to corporate action. On the first occasion, therefore, when I had the opportunity, I consulted the Archdeacons and Rural Deans as to the wisdom of this step; and, so far as I remember, there was absolute unanimity of opinion on the point. Accordingly, a committee was then and there appointed, and a constitution has since been framed by this committee. Following precedents which had been found to work well elsewhere, it was decided to take the ruri-decanal organisation as the basis of the representation at the Diocesan Conference.

" But this involved a preliminary step. The rural deaneries in the diocese still retained the same limits which they had when they were revived by Bishop Longley nearly a quarter of a century ago. But in the county of Durham more especially, the large increase of the population and the consequent erection of new parishes, had altogether changed the condition of things. In two points especially a reform was needed. First and foremost, several of the rural deaneries had grown so unwieldy as to be beyond the supervision of one man, almost necessarily, and always preferably, a parish clergyman, who can only give to his ruridecanal functions the time snatched from the onerous duties of his every-day parochial work. The inconvenience would have been sufficiently great to cry for a reform, if only the visitation of the parishes and the conferences of the clergy in the rural deanery had to be considered, as hitherto. Now, however, it was proposed that the ruridecanal conferences should no longer be confined to meetings of the clergy, but that several parishes should be invited to elect lay representatives, who should take part with the clergy in these gatherings for common consultation. A reform, as it seemed to us all, of the highest moment, and the happiest augury. Thus it became imperative to reduce the size of the rural deaneries, in order to meet this accession of numbers. Secondly, the old boundary lines of the rural deaneries were inconveniently drawn in many respects. Thus in several instances the larger towns were divided between two deaneries. In the city of Durham, for example, one-half belonged to the deanery of Chester Western division, and the other to that of Easington Southern Division; so that the vicar of St. Oswald's never met the vicar of St. Giles' in ruridecanal conference, though their common interests as neighbouring incumbents in the same city ought to have drawn them together. So, again, Monkwearmouth and Sunderland, though practically they are one great town, and the periodical grtherings instituted by the clergy themselves with the happiest results comprise both sides of the Wear. Then, again, the growth of the railway system had introduced a new element into the estimate of convenience or inconvenience. In actual

measurement of mileage a parish might be nearer to one ruridecanal centre, but through facilities of communication it was placed practically much closer to another. In such cases the altered conditions suggested a transference, where it could be done without inconvenience.

"For these reasons, after consultation with the Archdeacon of Durham and the Rural Deans of his archdeaconry, I submitted to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners a scheme for the rearrangement of the deaneries in the county of Durham, to which their assent was obtained; and in due time (July 9th, 1880) this scheme was gazetted and became law. For the seven deaneries, which comprised the whole county of Durham under the old arrangement, eleven are substituted by the new scheme. These bear historic names—such as Jarrow Wearmouth, and the like—not a few of them famous in the early annals of the Church. I did not meddle with the rural deaneries of the northern county, though some anomalies there also might with advantage have been rectified. But the inconveniences are much fewer than in the county of Durham, and I thought that this reform might well be left to one far more favourably situated than myself to carry it out, my immediate successor, the first Bishop of Newcastle.

"Simultaneously with and consequent upon these arrangements new Commissions, of which the terms had been carefully considered, were issued to all the Rural Deans in the diocese. Appointments were made to the deaneries erected under the new scheme, while several vacancies in the old deaneries, left by my predecessor, more especially in Northumberland, were filled up. The ruridecanal body is thus complete for the first time for a good many years. And here I cannot refrain from expressing publicly my deep sense of obligation to the Archdeacons and Rural Deans for their counsels and co-operation. To the Archdeacons, to whom the large share of the work falls, my thanks are due first and foremost. I do not suppose that any Bishop has ever received more loyal or more zealous aid from his Archdeacons than I do from mine. They grudge no labour and they shun no responsibility where the welfare of the Church is concerned. To the Rural Deans also I owe a special debt of gratitude. For services so cheerfully and zealously rendered—services not merely unpaid, bnt expensive of money as well as of time in themselves—I cannot express my thanks in too strong terms. It may, perhaps, be some compensation to them to be assured that their counsel and support go far to lighten a burden which, withont such aid, would at times be far too heavy for one man's shoulders to bear. It will be far more than compensation to feel that in working for the greater efficiency of the Church they are working for the glory of God and honour of Christ's Name. I am confident also that the parochial clergy, so far from regarding with jealousy the due exercise of the ruridecanal powers, will learn more and more to look to the Rural Dean for counsel and support in any difficulties, and that the ruridecanal organisation will in some measure supply that sense of fellowship and that strength of association of which the parochial clergyman feels himself at times so painfully in need. One and all, laity and clergy alike, we shall learn to realise more fully than hitherto, that we are not isolated combatants in a desultory struggle, but soldiers of a great army, officered, disciplined, marshalled for a steady campaign against ignorance and sin.

"The immediate results of this reorganization at all events have been most happy. The interest created by this measure has exceeded my best hopes. The first step was the election of lay representatives by the several parishes. The working of this part of the scheme has been most satisfactory. When the rules were drawn up by the committee there was much discussion whether the election of the lay representatives should be confined to communicants, or at least to members of the Church of England, or whether the parishioners assembled in vestry should be intrusted with this function. There was an obvious simplicity in this latter mode of election. In place of creating a new parochial organisation, it adopted one which already existed and was recognised by law. Moreover, it avoided definitions and distinctions which must be found awkward and invidious in practice. Ultimately this course was adopted. We thought that sufficient security was provided for the election of persons in proper sympathy with the objects in view, by directing that these representatives should themselves be communicants of the Church of England. The result has, I think, entirely justified this bold venture. So far as I am able to judge, the parochial representatives have almost without exception been the same who would have been chosen if the body of electors had been more restricted.

"The step next in order was the summoning of the ruridecanal conferences; and here, more especially, we have need to be thankful for the results. From one Rural Dean after another I have received the most cheering accounts of these meetings. There has been manifested on all hands, not only an earnest desire to forward the general work of the Church, but also (what perhaps, might less have been expected) a sympathetic interest in the revival of its corporate life, as embodied in these conferences. The ruridecanal chapters have elected as their representatives in this congress men who will be gladly welcomed here as counsellors. It has been especially gratifying to witness the active interest taken in the movement by the laity. Without their counsel and support the work of the clergy would been maimed and crippled indeed. I will not say more than this. They—the laity—must feel that they, not less than the clergy, are bound, each in his vocation and ministry, to promote the knowledge of God's truth and the extension of Christ's kingdom; and it would be little short of an insult to suggest, by words of special commendation, that they are doing some great thing when they thus claim their share in the responsibilities and the privileges of active Churchmanship.

"Under these circumstances we are met together today a representative body of the Clergy and laity of the diocese, to discuss the affairs of the Church. We shall all feel the responsibilities of our position. We are inaugurating a new movement; and the temper and conduct of this first conference must greatly influence those which will follow. We are speaking not among ourselves only, but to a large audience without; and by our words here spoken this outside world will judge us. There is need of frankness; for it is only by the frank interchange of opinions that any real progress can be made. But there is need also of moderation, of forbearance, of sympathy, of the steadfast resolve to understand the position and respect the motives of those who differ from ourselves. We believe in the Holy Ghost as a living, quickening agent, guiding the minds and moulding the hearts of men, not less now than He guided and moulded them eighteen centuries ago; and, believing this, we shall make it our first and last prayer that God will pour down upon this company of His servants the spirit of wisdom and

understanding, the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, the spirit of holiness and true godliness.

"I do not know how I can better inaugurate this our first conference than by spending the time which remains in viewing the work and prospects of the Church in this diocese. On three points more especially I am desirous of saying a few words.

"1. At the close of the last year I forwarded to the clergy statistics relating to the confirmations which had recently been held. These statistic sshowed a large, sudden, and (to myself I confess) altogether surprising increase in the numbers confirmed. Comparing the numbers confirmed in 1879-1880 with those confirmed in every two years preceding, I find an increase of fifty-five per cent. on the largest of these aggregates.

"The rite of confirmation, with the foregoing period of preparation and the subsequent receiving of the first Communion, is felt by every parochial clergyman to be an instrument of the highest value in the religious training of the young. I am glad to say that wherever I have had the opportunity of informing myself, the after effects in the different parishes have been most encouraging. For myself, I can honestly say that of all my Episcopal duties this is the one which gives me the most happiness; and I believe that on the part of the clergy no pains are too great to bestow on the preparation of candidates, because none bear fuller or richer fruit. The large increase which I have mentioned betokens a widening hold on the young; but the numbers still fall short of what they might be, and of what, I trust they will be. We may be greatly encouraged, but we must be far from content.

"2. The second point, to which I desire to direct attention, is the consecration of new churches and the formation of new parishes. I have already adverted to Bishop Baring's remark in his last Charge that 'the limit to the formation of new districts had almost been reached.' He goes on to suggest that the time had arrived when our attention 'should be mainly directed to the provision of Mission chapels, in the many hamlets distant from the parish church, and of a fund to supply the stipend of more curates and lay-leaders.' These are weighty words and supply food for much serious reflection as to the future. Greater economy of management, as well as greater efficiency of organisation, is possible in a system which retains the outlying populations grouped round the central mother church. But the existing regulations of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are so framed as to encourage the subdivision of parishes. Moreover, it must be remembered that the number of curates is already somewhat exceptionally large in this diocese in comparison with the number of incumbencies; and if the former were greatly increased, while the latter remained nearly constant, it would soon be difficult to secure a sufficiently rapid promotion for efficient curates—a consideration which it is most important to keep in view. At present, however, I do not see any abatement either in the consecration of churches or in the formation of parishes. In the four years which intervened between his last two visitations (1874—1878) Bishop Baring consecrated twenty-four churches. This is at the rate of six churches per annum. During the present year I have already consecrated six, and before the close I have reason to believe, from the applications which I have already received, that the number will have risen to ten at least. Even in the years of plenty I can only find one (1876) in which this number was exceeded (there were then eleven consecrations) and one other (1868) in which it was equalled; and we may therefore take courage from the fact that a year of scarcity has yielded this rich harvest. But here, again, though we may be thankful for the rate of progress, we cannot rest satisfied with the results. It is stated that the churches in the diocese furnish sittings for one-seventh only of the population—a much smaller proportion than in most English dioceses. The subdivision of parishes, too, has gone forward *pari passu*, and, so far as I can see, with speed undiminished.

"3. A third point is the number of candidates ordained to the diaconate, or, in other words, the supply of new clergy for the use of the diocese.

"In his last Charge Bishop Baring called attention to this subject. After consultation with the authorities of the University, he had postponed the time of the summer ordination from Trinity to a date immediately after the examination for degrees and licentiateships at Durham, hoping thus to obtain the Durham men, who otherwise would be drafted off to other dioceses. This practice could not be called an innovation, for it had been adopted by Bishop Maltby, but discontinued by his successor. The end was, at all events, attained. 'Four years ago,' says Bishop Baring, 'the number of deacons ordained in the four preceding years reached ninety, a larger number than any recorded in any former period of the same length. But in the last four years the number of deacons ordained is one hundred and nineteen, of whom thirty-seven, or nearly one-third, were members of the University of Durham.'

"For the first year I followed this precedent, as any deviation from it would have been inconvenient to every one concerned. But the disadvantages were not less obvious than the advantages. In the first place, the summer ordination in this diocese was isolated by this change, and thus it forfeited its share in the prayers which the whole Church offers up at the Ember Season for God's blessing on the choice of the Bishops, and on the lives and teaching of the newly-ordained. But there was a second serious drawback. The candidates from Durham were examined one week by the University, and the next, or the next but one, by the Bishop. Amidst the pressure of work and the anxiety of suspense, it was impossible that they could prepare themselves properly for the Bishop's examination, and next to impossible that they could approach this most solemn crisis of their lives with minds free from distraction. Accordingly, I have reverted to Trinity Sunday for the summer ordination. But, not to lose the advantages which my predecessor sought to secure, I have added a third ordination, for deacons only, in September. The result seems to justify this change. During the present year I have ordained twenty-seven deacons for this diocese in the two ordinations already past. But the Advent ordination is still to come, and if the number then ordained should equal, or nearly equal, the number in the corresponding ordinations of either of preceding years (thirteen in 1878, nine in 1879), the total would be considerably above the thirty which was the increased average of the four last years of my predecessor's Episcopate.

"This is the more saitsfactory, because I have thought it right to take a step which has tended to diminish the supply from our source. I do not desire to depreciate the work done by theological colleges. Some of the most zealous and efficient clergymen in my diocese were trained in these institutions. But it is important not to let the standard of attainments fall too low, and for this reason I have required students of theological colleges to pass the preliminary theological examination conducted by the Divinity Faculty of Cambridge as a condition of acceptance. As any

fairly-prepared student of average abilities is able to pass it, the condition is not onerous. Its imposition would, I believe, be found advantageous to the colleges themselves if it were more general, as supplying at once a standard of attainment and a stimulus for exertion; and it has to my knowledge been hailed with gladness by some on this very account. For the time, however, the supply of candidates from these quarters to the diocese of Durham has been diminished.

"As the total number, however, has not fallen short of the average, but rather exceeded it, it follows that the proportion of University men must have increased. Of the twenty-seven already ordained by me during the present year, fifteen are from the older Universities (five Oxford and ten Cambridge men), and nine have been educated at Durham, four being graduates and five licentiaties in theology. It will thus be seen that the proportion of Durham men is not altered at all, whereas the proportion of those drawn from Oxford and Cambtidge has been considerably increased. The statistics, as given in the *Diocesan Calendar*, show that during the four years to which Bishop Baring refers the proportion of men ordained from the older Universities was as nearly as possible one-fifth of the whole. During the present year it has been five-ninths.

"And here I would beg leave to say a few words by way of explanation. A Bishop cannot regard this matter from quite the same point of view as an incumbent who is looking out for a curate. The incumbent sees only the needs of the particular parish: the church is undermanned in that parish; he himself is harassed with the stress of work, and he considers (whether rightly or wrongly) that a man of very inferior attainments and efficiency is better than no curate at all. A Bishop is obliged to take a wider view. If he makes a concession in one case, he will be obliged to make it in another where there is no appreciable difference. The consequence will be a general lowering of the standard of the clergy. The dioeese will be gradually overrun by curates of a lower stamp. The time will come when it will be impossible to refuse the claim of these men to promotion on the ground of long service. Thus the incumbencies will be invaded by them. But the attractiveness of the curacy for a zealous young man depends very largely on the character, *status*, and ability of the incumbent who is to be his teacher and guide. In the next generation, therefore, the difficulty of obtaining good curates will be increased. The diocese will have got a bad name. All these considerations a Bishop is bound to keep in view. It goes to my heart again and again to refuse a man for ordination because he fails to satisfy my standard of requirements, when a hard-worked and meritorious incumbent presses for his acceptance. Yet the larger interests of the Church in the diocese leave me no choice.

"And this leads me by a natural transition to speak of a subject which I regard as supremely important at this crisis in the history of our Church. I mean the organisation of lay agency. The subject will come on for discussion this afternoon, and I trust it will be thoroughly sifted. It is a matter of common observation that Nonconformist communities are for the most part more forward than ourselves to utilise the zeal and energy of their lay members. It will be remembered also how Macaulay, in one of his essays, emphasises the greater wisdom of the Roman Church in adopting the irregular zeal of its laity and converting into its foremost champions those whom we should make our most dangerous enemies. Thus the lesson is pressed upon us from opposite sides. This seems to me to be the great practical question which our Church is invited to solve in this age.

"I do not indeed lay the stress chiefly on the negative reason, which Macaulay presses almost exclusively—that if you do not make this lay zeal your ally, it will certainly make itself your antagonist. I would rather urge the positive needs of the Church. Even if the supply of clergy were largely increased, it would still be unable to meet the growing demand for spiritual ministrations. Look at those extensive rural parishes in Northumberland—from fifteen to twenty miles long in some instances. How can a clergyman with the aid of a single curate supply regular services to the outlying parts? Look, again, at those thronged parochial districts in Newcastle, with perhaps fifteen thousand inhabitants or more. How is it possible for an incumbent, with even two or three curates (an almost ideal staff of clergy), to pierce effectively those densely welded masses of human beings? And so, again, with our colliery parishes, which stand midway between these extremes, where there is perhaps a central village or town as a nucleus with several outlying colonies of pitmen. Nothing but lay agency—and this on a very large scale—will meet these varied needs. What organisation is necessary for this purpose? what orders or offices should be created or revived? what functions should be assigned to them? what recognition they should receive? what qualifications should be imposed? what form of admission should be instituted?—these are the questions open for discussion.

"And with the large increase of numbers, which would thus accrue to the ministry of the Church, comes the possibility of more frequent, more widely spread, more diversified, more flexible services. Never in its long progress through the centuries has our Church encountered a fiercer competition than now. I do not speak of the rivalry of Dissent; I do not mean the antagonism of secularism. These, however powerful, are in some sense partial forces; and the former is our ally against the latter. I refer rather to an influence which affects all classes and individuals alike—the busy activities, the multiplied occupations and amusements, the diversified interests, social, political, and literary, of modern life. There is danger lest the Gospel message should be crowded out by these importunate throngs, and the still small voice be drowned by their noisy clamours. What must be done? We cannot re-make the circumstances, and therefore we must adapt ourselves to them. Where men are overwhelmed with business, we must interpose in the short intervals of respite. Where distracting influences compete on all sides, we must not wait for men to come for the Gospel; we must carry the Gospel to them. A short hearty ten minutes' service, with a few vigorous words of exhortation, will often be hailed as a refreshment under such circumstances, if it be offered, not obtruded. The mid-day Lenten services at St. Paul's Cathedral furnish one example of this; the services held in the workmen's sheds during dinner hours in some places in my own diocese supply another. This is a comparatively new opening for the energies of our Church. But to do it on any large scale lay assistance is needed. The regular troops of the great King must be supplemented by His volunteer forces.

(To be concluded in our next.)

The Rev. E. P. Blunt, who has been since 1874 vicar of Spetisbury-cum-Charlton Marshal, Dorset, has died suddenly of paralysis, at the age of seventy-five.

THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN ON THE BURIALS ACT.

The following reply has been written by the Bishop of Lincoln to the letter of the Bishop-Suffragan of Nottingham, which appeared in *The Pulpit* of Sept. 18th, in reference to the Burials Act :—

"Riseholme, Lincoln, September 20, 1880.

"My dear Brother—I have to thank you for communicating to me two addresses on the same subject; one from above six hundred clergymen of this diocese, the other from more than fourteen hundred clergymen of other dioceses, signifying their concurrence in the course followed by me with regard to the Burials Bill, which has now become law.

"It is gratifying to me to receive this assurance of their approval; and it will be a satisfaction to them to have relieved themselves from complicity with this measure, and from responsibility for its consequences.

"Let me express also my gratitude for this fresh proof of your brotherly kindness in the trouble you have bestowed so cheerfully in the correspondence and other labour entailed upon you by these communications.

"Whatever opinion we may have entertained of this measure before its legislative enactment it will now be our duty, as loyal subjects and faithful members of the Church, to do what we can, by forbearance, charity, and wisdom, to mitigate and neutralise the evils which we have apprehended from it.

"Let me avail myself of this opportunity for submitting to you, and to others through you, some statements and observations upon it. You will, I think, agree with me that, under existing circumstances, it is not desirable to make any additions to our churchyards; and that even for sanitary reasons many of our churchyards ought to be closed as soon as possible. As at present advised I do not propose to consecrate any additions to churchyards.

"A few words as to cemeteries. Hitherto, by virtue of the Cemetery Acts (10 and 11 Vict., cap. 65; 15 and 16 Vict., cap. 85; and 16 and 17 Vict., cap. 134), certain portions of cemeteries have been consecrated for interments according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, and other portions of them, have been left unconsecrated.

"The new Burials Act virtually repeals those acts. The distinction between the consecrated and unconsecrated parts is now obliterated. Every cemetery is now open alike indiscriminately for all such burials as are authorised by the act.

"And this law will apply to all new cemeteries. Consequently, to set apart by consecration any portion of a cemetery for the purpose of burials according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England would, I conceive, be to contravene the spirit of the act; and such consecration would be a nullity; and for my own part I should shrink from the performance of any solemn religious act, such as consecration, which might, perhaps, be held to be illegal, and would certainly be unmeaning, nugatory, and invalid.

"This result of the act may, I fear, cause pain and distress to some devout persons, members of the Church of England, who desire consecration for the ground to which the mortal remains of their departed friends and relatives will be committed, to repose there in peace and in hope of a joyful resurrection.

"In order to minister comfort to such persons, the best course (as it seems to me and to others whom I have consulted) would be to provide a form of benediction to be used at each grave, before the interment takes place.

"But on this, and some other matters arising out of the new act, I should wish to have the benefit of your opinion, and that of the other Archdeacons and Rural Deans of the diocese, and of the Chapter of our cathedral church; and I propose, therefore, to take an early opportunity of deliberating with them on these questions. I have already conferred upon them with the Chancellor of the diocese.

"In reference to such questions, it may be useful to consider the practice of other Churches. In France the cemeteries in the largest towns and cities (such as Pere la Chaise, at Paris) are the property of the civil authorities, and have not been consecrated; and in such cemeteries burials of any persons may take place indiscriminately.

"Whenever any portion of a cemetery is consecrated (and it may be blessed by a priest with a commission from the Bishop) it is reserved for the interment of members of the Church. The same custom prevails in some other countries. The principal part of the funeral service, properly so called, is not performed, in either case, in the cemetery itself, but within the walls of the church. A few words only, I believe, in form of a benediction, are said by the minister at the grave.

"Our own form of service, hitherto used in the consecration of a churchyard, or of part of a cemetery, does not rest on the authority of Convocation or Parliament, but only on that of the Diocesan; and it would probably, by parity of reasoning, be competent to him to authorise a parish priest to do for each several grave—*mutatis mutandis*, and in a short and simple form—what has hitherto been done for a portion of a churchyard or of a cemetery.

"I submit these remarks for your consideration and that of others; and now one word in conclusion.

"In proportion as secular supports fail us, and temporal powers, to which we have hitherto looked for help, are arrayed against us, we shall learn to feel more and more where our true strength lies. Whatever treatment we may receive from the State, we shall not, I hope, abate one jot of our patriotism. We shall do all in our power, as ministers of the Gospel of peace and love, to maintain the cause of order and law, by fervent prayer, and faithful preaching, and loyal service, and to promote the welfare of the institutions of our country, and of all classes of the community. But we shall also look upward and forward; we shall rely more and more on the support of Him from Whom we derive our sacred commission and our spiritual strength; and to Whom we owe humble obedience and holy worship, and Who is King of kings and Lord of lords, and Who has promised to be always with His Church, even to the end of the world.—I am, your affectionate brother,

C. LINCOLN.

"The Right Rev. the Bishop-Suffragan
of Nottingham."

The west front of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, is being re-faced with new stone by the Dean and Chapter, and the pathway in front of the Albert Memorial Chapel and the deanery is being widened.

We are informed that the vacancy among the residentiary Canons of Gloucester Cathedral caused by the death of the Rev. Sir J. H. Culme-Seymour has been filled up by the appointment of the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Lyttelton, rector of Hagley, a brother of the late Lord Lyttelton.

CORRESPONDENCE.

BISHOPRIC OF SOUTHWELL ENDOWMENT AND RESIDENCE FUNDS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—In view of the exclusion of the recommendations of Convocation from legislation affecting the Church—a sign of the tendency of the day towards secularism—it is I think, encouraging to find such a readiness on the part of your readers to join in any effort for the well-being of the Church.

Thus, for example, the proposal which originated in your columns of the 21st inst. respecting the above fund has already elicited responses from as many as six beneficed clergy, willing to act as a committee for the promotion of the object suggested by Mr. Peel, and since very favourably entertained by the Bishop of Lincoln's Suffragan, the Bishop of Nottingham.

From a circular, dated St. Batholomew's Day, issued by this committee, with the sanction of the latter Bishop, the public will learn that the clergyman authorised by the Bishop to receive subscriptions is beneficed in one of the dioceses—that of Lincoln—to be benefited by the proposed fund, and that to enable the less well-to-do classes to contribute, the limitation as to the amount named by Mr. Peel will not be adhered to.

The clergy who have taken up the movement represent as many different dioceses, but it is unfortunate that the treasurer alone—as the representative of the Bishop of Nottingham—will work in one of the districts to be benefited by the scheme.

As the midland counties of Staffordshire, Derbyshire, and Nottingham, together with Shropshire and Lincolnshire, will derive advantage from the promotion of the "fund," it is hoped that the clergy beneficed in these counties will take an active interest in the subject, and enable their flocks to share intelligently in that interest by reminding them that they likewise are concerned in the success of the movement.

The committee are confident that they will do this the more readily in consequence of the Bishop of Lincoln's urgent appeal for the aid of Churchmen and Churchwomen towards the establishment of the bishopric—an object for which he earnestly prays through the pressure now weighing him down, as well as for the benefit of the diocese independently of himself.

Several subscriptions have already been promised towards the two branches of the scheme. Thus the Bishop of Nottingham's contribution of £500 towards the "Endowment" Fund, and one of the same amount from the Dowager Duchess of Cleveland on behalf of the "Residence" Fund—a necessary and useful distinction—may well form the nuclei round which the results of a spontaneous effort like the present may cluster in the form of offerings, large or small, in token of the gratitude towards a benefactor of the Church due from her still faithful adherents.

In obedience to a suggestion emanating from a high authority, the "Endowment" Fund is recommended to the support of the clergy and laity generally—and this effort is headed by the Bishop of Nottingham; while the other, headed by the Dowager Duchess of Cleveland—viz., the "Residence" Fund—is committed to the care of the ladies. As this is the line indicated in the enclosed circular, it is obviously thought to be desirable to keep these two objects apart, as some may like to give to the "Residence" in preference to the larger fund, and the episcopal residence is as much needed as the endowment of the future Bishops of Southwell. It is desirable, at least, that the donor indicate the destination of his or her contribution, so as to prevent any misapprehension with respect to a similar movement on behalf of the Chancellor's Schools, published in the *Times* to-day, from the Precentor.

Stanford-le-Hope, August 30, 1880. G. E. W.

THE "WORDSWORTH MEMORIAL" FUND.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—May I ask for space to acquaint your readers with the existence of a Testimonial Fund towards which I am daily receiving subscriptions from persons who signed the "Address of Thanks" prepared by the Bishop of Nottingham, and recently presented to the Bishop of Lincoln? The sum I have already received is considerable, and I feel sure that when the existence of the Fund is more widely known, many will be glad of a practical way of testifying their admiration of our good Bishop's noble opposition to the Burials Bill. The total amount will ultimately be offered to the Bishop of Lincoln as a "Testimonial Gift" towards the Endowment of the See of Southwell—an object which there is good ground for saying is very dear to him.

I shall be glad to receive, and will acknowledge, subscriptions, and request that P.O.O. may be drawn on Brigg, and cheques crossed "Smith, Ellison & Co."

CHAS. W. MARKHAM.

Saxby Rectory, Barton-on-Humber,
Feast of S. Matthew, 1880.

Liturgical Reading.—Preaching.—"Clerical Sore Throat."—The following intelligence may prove of interest to clergy resident in London who are desirous of being instructed in the management of the voice:—The eminent Professor, Charles J. Plumptre, Lecturer on public reading and speaking, in King's College, Strand (Evening Class), will begin a course of practical lectures on next Friday evening, the 8th of October, at 8 o'clock p.m. Clergymen, Barristers, Students, and others will be admitted gratuitously, on presenting their cards. The first part of the proposed course will consist of a series of Lectures to be given every Tuesday and Friday evening, commencing at the before-mentioned hour. The Lecturer will speak upon the following subjects:—Physiology of he organs of speech; development and management of the voice; causes of "clerical sore throat;" defects in articulation; reading and extempore speaking in public. The Lectures will terminate in the March of next year, and the fee for the entire course, payable to the College, is £1 11s. 6d. Professor Plumptre will shortly publish a new and greatly enlarged edition of his "King's College Lectures," in which the subjects of Liturgical reading and preaching will be treated at considerable length.

The Rev. Sir J. C. Hawkins, Bart., having been unable, on account of the state of his health, to preach a farewell sermon as rector of Chelmsford on Sunday evening, has issued a short address to his parishioners, in which he takes leave of them and thanks them for the kindness, consideration, and support which he has received at their hands.

Sabbath Keeping Two Hundred and Fifty Years Ago.—A correspondent of the *City Press*, who has been hunting over the records of an old castle in Northumberland, has discovered a copy of a curious proclamation issued by the Lord Mayor of London by order of the Long Parliment in 1642, a similar injunction being apparently put forth at the same time by the justices of the peace throughout England and Wales. The proclamation first of all calls attention to "the fact that the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, is of late much broken and prophaned by a disorderly sort of people in frequenting taverns, alehouses, and the like, and in carrying and putting to sale victual, and other things, and exercising unlawful games and pastimes to the great dishonour of God, and reproach of religeon." This state of things was regarded as calling for summary measures, and accordingly the churchwardens and constables (fancy the churchwardens undertaking this kind of work nowadays!) were to have "strict charge and command" to put a stop to all such proceedings; and a long list is given of things that might not be allowed, the primary offence to which exception is taken being "tippling in any taverne, wine, tobacco-shop, alehouse, or other victualling house whatsoever." No fruiterers or herb-women were to offer their wares for sale, the milk-women were to abstain from crying milk, vessels were not to be unladen, or goods to be carried, or unlawful exercises and pastimes were to be indulged in, and express charge was to be given to the keepers of inns, taverns, cookshops, tobacco-houses, and the like, who would seem to have been a troublesome lot from the special attention bestowed upon them, that they should not suffer any tippling, eating, drinking, or tobacco-taking on the part of their customers, an exception, however, being made for the benefit of *bonâ fide* travellers. This curious document concludes with ominous allusions to the pains and penalties awaiting offenders, who were to be promptly brought before the proper authorities.

In some of the city and suburban churches in the Dublin Diocese, allusion was made, on Sunday last, to the Divine beneficence in causing the harvest to be abundant. The aspect of the sister country, in that respect was thus contrasted with its disastrous condition in others, in a sermon preached, upon the subject of Christian gratitude, by the Rev. Chancellor Tisdall:—"Is it brethren, with lively gratitude that you join in saying 'Amen,' when thanks are rendered to the Supreme Benefactor in the corporate worship of the Church, 'for all His goodness and loving-kindness?' We meet at a time when 'the kindly fruits of the earth' have been gathered in abundance—the Almighty having graciously 'crowned the year with His goodness'—making His ripening sun to rise 'upon the evil and the good, and sending His fertilizing rain upon the just and the unjust.' Our land, in other respects, in a condition truly deplorable by reason of stagnation in trade—agrarian disturbances—insecurity of property and even of life, has been blessed with a harvest more luxuriant than has been reaped for many an autumn. While deploring the evils consequent upon that prevalent disaffection which has been, and is still, encouraged by the inflammatory utterances of political agitators, let us seriously reflect how much more lamentable would the state of the country be had the crops been scanty, if super-added to national commotion the prospect of scarcity had to be encountered. Graciously has He who delights in shewing mercy willed it otherwise, for He has brought agricultural labour to a prosperous issue. If, unhappily, we do not enjoy 'peace within our borders' because the rights of property are invaded, we have been most generously dealt with by the 'Father of all mercies.' Surely the thought of those acres which recently 'stood thick with corn' should be associated in our minds with reflections, both grateful and humiliating—grateful because God's blessing as 'Giver of the increase,' human effort would have been to no purpose—humiliating, because as His 'husbandry' we cannot but be conscious that we have not been as fruitful as we ought to have been, in proportion to our many opportunities in those 'works of faith,'—'those labours of love,' of which Christian doctrine is adorned."

A meeting was held at the Chapter-house of St. Paul's Cathedral, on Monday, to consider the desirability of raising a memorial to the late Rev. C. F. Lowder. Canon Liddon, and afterwards Lord Nelson, presided. The following resolution was passed, and a committee was formed for carrying it out:—"That a sum of £10,000 be raised as a memorial to the late Rev. C. F. Lowder, to be expended in completing the works which he began in connection with St. George's Mission, and in clearing off any existing liabilities." A "Lowder Memorial Fund" account has been opened at Messrs. Barnet and Co.'s, Lombard-street. Mr. Lister Beck was appointed treasurer. Letters of sympathy were read from Dr. Pusey, the Dean of St. Paul's, Canon Courtenay, Dr. West, &c.

At Bangor Mr. Watkin Williams, Q.C., on Friday expressed his concurrence with Dean Stanley's letter as to the "real nationalisation" of the Church. When disestablishment took place there would, he thought, probably be a confederation of Christian Churches. He rejoiced to find that the clergy, as a rule, loyally accept the Burials Act.

The east window in St. Ouen's Church, Jersey, has within the last few days been filled with stained glass by Messrs. Hardman. The window is in three lights, representing (1) the Baptism, (2) the Crucifixion, and (3) the Resurrection. It is given in memory of the former "Seigneurs de St. Ouen," by Colonel E. C. Malet de Carteret, the present "Seigneur."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bennett, Rev. Edward, rector of Dalby; vicar of Laneham, Notts.

Birch, Rev. Augustus J., vicar of Edlesborough, Bucks; rector of Berkhampstead St. Mary (or North Church).

Dowling, Rev. R. B., curate of St. Mark's, North Audley-street, chaplain to the Bishop of Bedford.

Elwyn, Rev. Richard, hon canon of Canterbury; vicar of East Farleigh.

Heanley, Rev. R. M., rector of Wainfleet; honorary secretary of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa.

Hughes, Rev. D., curate of Llangian, Pwllheli; vicar of Llanegryn.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blount, Rev. Edward Powlett, at Spettisbury Rectory, rector of Spettisbury-cum-Charlton, Dorset, on the 24th ult.

Frampton, Rev. John, canon of Gloucester, fifty-two years vicar of Tetbury, on the 22nd ult., aged 82.

Girdlestone, Rev. John Gay, at Kelling Rectory, rector of Kelling and Salthouse, on the 24th ult., aged 65.

Graham, Rev. Reuben, B.A., patron and first priest of St. Mary's, Plaistow, Kent, on the 23rd ult.

Kerr, Rev. William Mignot, J.P., at Novendon Rectory, Essex, upwards of thirty years rector of the parish, on the 22nd ult., aged 64.

Morehead, Rev. George Jeffrey, B.D., at Easington Rectory, Yorkshire, for forty years rector of the parish of Easington-cum-Liverton, on the 21st ult., aged 66.

The Church of England Pulpit.

WHAT IS WISDOM?

By the Rev. Dr. SALMON, Regius Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, Dublin.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday, May 30, 1880.

"And unto man he said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding."—Job xxviii. 28.

THE maxim of the text appears in slightly different forms in more than one of the Old Testament books. In one of the Easter Day Psalms we have "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; a good understanding have all they that do thereafter, the praise of it endureth for ever." And so again in the Book of Proverbs, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the Holy is understanding." And in several other of Solomon's proverbs the same idea is expressed in slightly different words. The name of Solomon has become proverbial among ourselves for wisdom. He deeply impressed his contemporaries both by his acquired knowledge and by his natural sagacity. He was held to be wiser than all men; his wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the East country and all the wisdom of Egypt. He was wiser than all whom the Hebrews of his day reverenced as sages, wiser than Ethan the Ezrahite, wiser than Heman and Chalcol and Darda. His fame was in all nations round about, and travellers came from distant lands to see his riches and to hear his wisdom. Yet in great part of the Book of Proverbs the word wisdom is only used as the name of a quality in which Solomon was confessedly not pre-eminent; only as another name for goodness and the fear of God. Yet the more we think of the matter, the more reason we shall see to be convinced that other qualities which have been honoured by the name of wisdom are but vain pretenders to that title, and that this alone in truth deserves it.

First, wisdom is not learning. A great part of what his contemporaries admired in Solomon consisted of the accumulated mass of facts with which his memory was stored. He could speak of trees from the cedar that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall; he could speak also of beasts and of fowl, of creeping things, and of fishes. Yet it is an observation we are constantly forced to make, how much a man may know and yet what a fool he may be. Even in his own subject his industry in acquiring knowledge may easily outrun his power to make profitable use of it; and from weakness of judgment the opinions he forms on the subjects on which he has bestowed most labour may be absolutely entitled to no respect. But even if he is completely successful in his own department, whether or not it be as common as men of the world are apt to think, it is assuredly common enough that a man may be a very great scholar and yet a simpleton in all that concerns the practical affairs of daily life. That Solomon, for instance, with all his wisdom was a wise ruler we have not the slighest reason to suppose. He did successfully accomplish the ends which he made it his ambition to attain, but, as usually is the case with Eastern rulers, those ends concerned rather the magnificeuce of the sovereign than the real welfare of the people. He struck out new commercial enterprises, but these he probably carried on as monopolies for his personal benefit and added nothing to the wealth of the nation. They enabled him to astonish his subjects with the sight of foreign luxuries not brought to Jerusalem before; horses and fine linen from Egypt, gold and ivory and apes and peacocks imported from the distant East. Thus the Hebrew monarchy was in his time surrounded with unheard-of state, and the splendour of his court surpassed all that his people had ever heard of; nor probably did either he or they for some time consider whether all this costly splendour did not overpass the resources of the small state which he governed. He had an enormous harem of seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines; he had magnificent palaces at Jerusalem and summer palaces at Lebanon; stately gardens, golden plate in such abundance that silver was nothing accounted of in his reign. The hasty reader is so impressed with all that is told of this magnificence that he often fails to take notice of what is also told of the cost at which it was kept up, the corvées of forced labour, the grinding taxation of the subjects. We find that on the king's death the oppressed people insisted on an absolute change of system, and failing to obtain it hurled his dynasty from the throne; while all the wealth that had been brought together only served as a lure to attract the foreign invader, and in five years from Solomon's death Jerusalem had been taken and all the accumulated riches carried off to Egypt.

Again, wisdom is not cleverness, though it is often mistaken for it, especially by the young who are apt to give to a certain kind of intellectual ability a great deal more of admiration than it deserves. I refer to that kind of ability which finds it easy to invent arguments in favour of any line of action it wishes to commend, which is not easily taken by surprise, is ready with plausible answers to objections, and can throw into the most attractive form the reasons for coming to the desired conclusion. All this, however, is but the

cleverness of the advocate; what we really want for our practical guidance is the wisdom of the judge. Suppose that a man urges us to go the way that it is contrary to our real interests to go, the more persuasive is his eloquence, the greater his skill in producing reasons for the wrong course, the greater the mischief he does to those that give ear to him and to himself if he believes in his own arguments. So again in mere literary or scientific investigatious, where we are not concerned with action, the cleverness which can maintain an ingenious paradox, or which can so marshal arguments as to make a false explanation of facts appear satisfactory, may receive admiration from the unthinking, but only disgusts him whose sole wish is to know what is the truth. It is natural that in our free country an exaggerated value should be attached to that oratorical or argumentative power which characterizes the successful advocate; for skill to form the wisest schemes of statesmanship would be a barren gift if not accompanied by the ability to commend to others the conclusions which have been arrived at. In order that any useful measure may be carried he who advocates it must be able to persuade a large number of persons of its expedience. Skill in such persuasion is therefore with us an absolute necessity of political success, and there are always among the rulers of the country some who owe their position to their eminence in it. And though no doubt there is a presumption that they who succeed in making others think that they are giving wise counsel really deserve the character they bear, yet it is a very different thing to be a brilliant orator and a wise statesman. Many instances might be given of persons who have exercised great influence in the House of Commons, though with powers of speech less than the average, solely on account of the trust that was put in their honesty and good sense. But we may meet with illustrations enough in our daily life, what very different things are cleverness and wisdom. It may happen to you to be opposed by persons on whose friendship you thought you might have counted; unkind words may have been said to you, a slighting and disparaging estimate of you expressed. And you may have it in your power by a stinging retort to cover your assailant with confusion: and by exposing some inconsistency or fastening on some weakness of his to take ample vengeance. If you do this readily and wittily you may produce a great impression of your intellectual ability. No intellectual ability at all is required for holding your tongue, and yet to submit in silence may be far the wisest course. In such a case the line of conduct dictated by Christian meekness may be also that approved by worldly prudence. A man who opposes you when your interests come into collision with his may not be really your enemy if you do not permanently make him so, or if you do not by damaging his reputation destroy his power as well as his willingness to serve you another time. And if you are angry because a more slighting estimate has been expressed of you than you think you deserve, why, in the first place, it is possible that it may be you who overrate yourself, but if not, it may still be the wisest to wait patiently till misconceptions clear themselves away; for as a general rule people in the long run get quite as much honour as they deserve; and any anger or impatience about such a matter only delays the recognition of their merit.

But I find that in thus giving as an illustration the fact that Christian meekness is true wisdom, I am only anticipating in a particular case, the general principle asserted in the text, that the fear of the Lord is wisdom. From one point of view it will occur to many that this principle must be undoubtedly true. If we look on practical wisdom as that which guides us to the line of conduct best calculated to secure our happiness, it must undoubtedly be wise to secure the favour of Him who is infinite in power and whose rewards are eternal. It is quite a commonplace to point out the folly of the man who professes to believe in a future life, yet lives as if this world were to be his home for ever. It is just the same, it has been said, as if an officer under government temporarily employed here, but who knows that he must soon expect orders to proceed to a distant station, and there take up his permanent home, were to invest all his property here in a form incapable of being removed with him. But we are not obliged to make our assent to the principle of the text depend on our faith in the sanctions of a future life. God's commandments are not grevious, and even as far as this life is concerned it is our happiness and our wisdom to obey them. If we glance through the commandments of the Decalogue we cannot doubt the folly of disregarding them. We shall own that it is the fool who hath said in his heart There is no God: that those are fools who put their trust in graven images and bow down to the work of their own hands; and so on with regard to the other commandments which enjoin the duty of worshipping God, which maintain the sanctity of family life, proclaiming the duties of children to parents, of husbands and wives, which enjoin personal purity, which forbid injury to our neighbour in person or property, or in his family relations, and which guard the outward conduct by waging war on the sinful desires from which sinful actions spring; all these commandments are such that any thoughtful man must own that it is his interest as well as his duty to comply with them. But when we turu to the New Testament we find a basis for Christian ethics very different from that of the most enlightened selfishness. If we receive the teaching of that book, the spring of our actions must be love to Christ; and likeness to Christ the model of perfection at which we must aim. And what was the character of Christ? The Apostle sums it up in the words "Christ

pleased not Himself." It does indeed sound like a truism to say that our Blessed Lord's life on earth was not one of self-indulgence. You are all so familiar with the details of His life that you need not to be reminded what He endured for man's sake. His victory over the temptations of Satan in the wilderness indicated the character of His entire life. The temptations which He rejected there He rejected absolutely and for ever. The allurements of appetite, the charms of earthly power, the desire of popularity, found no place among the motives of his conduct. Destitute of all the world counts necessary for happiness, He went about in ceaseless labours for the good of others, diffusing bodily health and spiritual instruction, regardless of selfish ease, regardless of the opposition He too often met with from those He came to benefit; mindful only of the great object for which He had come, to seek and to save them which were lost. You know that all what He previously submitted to for our sakes was but preliminary to that closing proof of love (the greatest as He Himself said that any can give) to lay down his life for his friends. Nay not even then His friends, since as the Apostle tells us, while we were yet enemies Christ died for us. The Gospels moreover informs us that the Lord's humiliation was a voluntary descent from glory which He possessed with the Father before the world was: that His continuance in this humiliation was equally voluntary; that in the darkest hour of His agony legions of angels stood ready at His call, but the word of summons was not given because then the scriptures of the prophets would not have been fulfilled; those scriptures which had inseparably connected the redemption of man with the travail of the soul of the Redeemer. And it was not merely that our Saviour's humiliation must have been felt more keenly as contrasted with the height of glory from which He had descended; what the scriptures reveal as to the higher nature He possessed suggests other reflections as to the way in which that very nature must have increased the weight of what His human nature had to bear. His divine foreknowledge must have kept present to Him during the whole time of His humiliation the bitterness of that agony by which on the night of Gethsemane His humanity was almost overwhelmed, while His knowledge of the hearts of men enabled Him to discern that even of those whom He had chosen out of the race for which He came to suffer, one was a traitor, and the rest would in the hour of danger desert Him. Privations present, and anguish constantly foreseen, submitted to, thanklessly submitted to for the sake of others, from all of which a word would at any moment have relieved Him; such is the account of the Saviour's life on earth. This was the life which His first converts set before them as the model for their imitation. As He loved us, so ought we also to love one another, was their maxim. It was ever vividly present to their minds what He their Master and Lord had suffered for them, and the thought what He had endured for their sakes was ready to rise to rebuke any selfish shrinking from danger or toil or privation which their brethren's good required them to encounter. "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus," was the Apostle's exhortation. Christ pleased not Himself, so let every one of you please his neighbour for his good to edification. Here, then, is the paradox of Christianity. "The fear of the Lord is wisdom," is the declaration of the Old Testament. Wisdom teaches us to provide for our happiness in the most enlightened way, rejecting those pleasures which are of a lower order, or which are but temporary, and will be followed by greater pain, and choosing those which are higher and lasting. But here we have what seems quite a different rule; seek not your own happiness at all; live and work for the happiness of others; give up all thought of self, all calculation how you may make yourself greater or more honoured or more prosperous. That may be more noble conduct, but can it be said to be wisdom?

The key to the paradox is found in that golden saying of our Lord which St. Luke has preserved for us in an after gleaning made after his history of our Lord's life had been finished, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." This strikes a higher key than is touched in some of those Gospel lessons in which our Lord had inculcated the duty of giving. Give, He had said, not to those from whom you hope to receive a return; not even with a view to men's praises. Let the praise of Him who seeth in secret be enough for you. Give to those who cannot recompense you, and you shall be recompensed at the resurrection of the just. But here we have the doctrine, not of future recompense for self-sacrifice, but of its present blessedness. That it truly is more blessed to give than to receive, however paradoxical the utterance when first made may have sounded, we cannot for a moment doubt. Our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount had told His desciples that in not allowing their love to be repelled by the unworthiness of its object, they should be like their Heavenly Father who maketh His sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. And if it must be happiness to be like Him who is all blessed as He is bountiful, His blessedness cannot consist in receiving anything from the creatures who can add nothing to His majesty. To give where no return *can* be made must be His blessedness, and that must be happiness for those who are like Him. And there is no difficulty in understanding that this really is the case. Those to whom God has given powers find happiness in their exercise quite independently of the fruits the powers may gain. It is not true, or it is a mere fraction of the truth that "love of fame is the spur which the clear spirit doth raise, to scorn delights and live laborious days." An unsub-

stantial recompense if this were all; nor would prudence find it easy to justify the giving up of solid comfort for the sake of having our vanity incensed by praise—praise that, perhaps, may never reach our ear and may not come till after we are dead. But I believe the truth to be, that though many when trying to give an account to themselves why they lived laborious days may have thought to vindicate their prudence by the prospect of future praise, this was not their real motive. Their happiness was in the work itself and the laborious days brought them higher delight than selfish ease could have offered. And in the case of work done for others, it is not only that there is pleasure in the exercise of our powers; it is not only that it is more flattering to our pride to give than to receive; but the heart must be cold which does not find delight when through our gift happiness springs up for others and their sorrow is turned into joy. Cases are of constant occurrence when no other reward is sought for efforts to give pleasure to others than some evidence that these efforts have been successful. Take for instance maternal love, the most striking example of the happiness love finds in giving without thought of receiving. If a baby laughs and crows it is thought to make an ample return for all the attentions that are lavished on it. If there can be any doubt as to the comparative wisdom of him who places his happiness in receiving or in giving when both are successful in their aims, we can have no doubt in the case when they fail. Indeed when can he be said to succeed who places his happiness in self-aggrandisement? For ever as he reaches those whom in the race for greatness he had made it is ambition to overtake, it seems to him but a poor victory to have conquered these; when he sees, as he must, others still in advance of him, who now appear the only competitors worthy of his rivalry. And when failure comes, as come it will, how ignoble are the sorrows of him who has sought great things for himself and found them not. How little sympathy we can give to the smartings of wounded vanity, to the disappointed graspings of ambition, to the confusion of him who having claimed the highest place is compelled to descend with shame to a lower room. Contrast with these the worst sorrow that can be suffered by one whose happiness is giving, the pain of love repulsed. It will often happen that attempts to do kindness to others are not received in the spirit in which they are offered. If we needed proof that giving has a happiness of its own as much as receiving, we should easily find conviction from our experience that there may be as much selfishness in refusing to receive as in refusing to give. Sometimes the refusal may spring from an amiable perversity of disposition which loves to disappoint expectation and grudges a pleasure which it is perceived is counted on: sometimes it may proceed from scorn of the poor gift offered, which is disdainfully brushed aside without appreciation of the kindly feelings, perhaps the labour and sacrifice, made by the giver; sometimes it may proceed from a sturdy spirit of independence, too proud to bear the burden of an obligation, and willing to forego a coveted good rather than be beholden to another for the enjoyment of it. That even in this last case, with feelings highly worthy of respect there may be mixed up a great deal of selfish disregard of the the feelings of others we need not delay to point out. But we plainly are forced to own that it is not the selfish man alone who must count on meeting occasional disappointment: the most generous, the most loving is liable to have his motives misinterpreted, or his love cast back. How are we then to strike a balance? Can we say that the grief of wounded affection is less keen than the pain caused by the failure of schemes for self-aggrandisement? If we cannot say this, perhaps we might say that the sorrows of love are more noble than the delights of selfishness, and that it is a more blessed thing to have even felt disappointment in giving than to have had success in receiving. But it is more to the purpose to observe that such disappointment only brings pain with it in proportion as selfishness has animated the motives of the giver. There were some early Christians who imagined a flame through which all at the end of the world must pass, through which those would pass unscathed who were pure from earthly defilement, but which would fasten on all in the soul that was mean and base, and so give much or little pain in proportion as there was much or little that must be burned away. Of this kind is the pain which the bountiful receive when their gifts are rejected. If their generosity has been but refined selfishment, if they have given only because they wished to have their pride gratified by the acknowledgment of other's dependence, because they delight in receiving thanks and praise, or because in some other way they hope to be paid back again by those whom they have benefited, the disappointment of such expectations as these must not count among the sorrows of love, they rather go to swell the list of the vexations to which selfishness in all its forms is liable. But if the giver's kindly act is really promoted by the single motive, the desire to promote the happiness of its object: if it spring from that truly unselfish love which can rejoice in the happiness of those we love even when they prefer that that happiness shall come to them in a way to which we cannot contribute: then the sting is taken out of disappointment, and what might have been at first pain to us is turned into matter of rejoicing. St. Paul may teach us the spirit proper to those who have their heart more in the cause for which they labour than in the credit to be won for themselves from promoting it. He heard of the exertions made in preaching Christ by men who were his rivals and his enemies; and

he exclaimed, "Whatever their motives Christ is preached and I therein do rejoice."

If then the New Testament has taught us to understand by "the fear of the Lord" somewhat more than had been distinctly revealed in the Old Testament; if it teaches us that it means to be children of Him who is kind to the unthankful and the evil: to be followers of Him who gave His life for sinners ungrateful and rebellious: still we can truly say the fear of the Lord is wisdom. Butler has illustrated the profitable effects of virtue by imagining the prosperity of a community of perfectly virtuous persons. If you want to know what are the fruits of that which is a higher and a warmer thing than mere virtue, real love for others, such as that of which our Redeemer's earthly life is the highest pattern, we need only imagine His example followed by a single individual. Imagine that any one systematically wove into an entire life the practice of these lessons of our Lord and you would have to own that such a one, whatever his or her intellectual gifts might be, was one of the wisest of human beings, wisest both in providing for his own happiness, and wisest if counsel were sought by others. It is eminently true of love, give and it shall be given to you. If one were found by experience to be perfectly free from selfish aim, one by whom no unkind word was ever spoken, one who was always planning some act of kindness to others, who grudged no trouble to make them happier; it is impossible but that such a one would inspire such perfect trust, and would be surrounded by such love and gratitude as would brighten his own life as he strove to brighten those of others. To such a one we could come in any difficnlty for advice, in full confidence that the counsel given would be prompted by no thought of the interests or wishes of the adviser, and that we should be told not what was pleasantest for us, but what was really wise and right for us to do. And in matters of conduct, perplexity as to the right course so often arises, not from any real difficulty in seeing what path duty points out, as from shrinking from trouble that following it might impose, or from a hankering after enjoyment of some kind to be found on another road, that mere singleness of mind and purpose confers an insight denied to those whose vision is clouded by selfish desire. And such insight will often prevent charity towards others from degenerating into weak blindness to their faults. For when the right course is discerned it is impossible not to take notice when others turn aside from following it. And the disguises by which they justify their conduct to themselves become transparent to one of greater simplicity of character. It is no small part of practical wisdom in the course of this world's conduct to have the gift of insight into character, and to be able to judge correctly who may be trusted and how far. But you will not need to be told that it is higher wisdom in a higher sense than this to which the text refers, even though it may not have been amiss to point out how godliness has the promise of the life that now is as well of that which is to come. May we, brethren, ever daily strive to be more and more like Him who is the Eternal Wisdom of the Father, that hereafter we may be with Him where He is—when they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1880.

IN the present disturbed state of affairs in Ireland, where confiscation and murder are rampant, being unchecked, if not actually fostered, by the disintegrating policy of the Government, the Rev. Courtenay Moore's account of Bishop Bèdell will be read with interest and instruction. It is interesting to see how a man like Bèdell bore himself in the troublous times in which his lot was cast; and instructive to see the powerful influence for good which his life had upon the people amongst whom he lived. The abolition of the Protestant Church, and the consequent withdrawal of such characters, whether lay or ecclesiastical, from the island has been we think a heavy blow and great discouragement to the peace and prosperity of Ireland. To promote these, we require not the Gladstonian policy of confiscation and disintegration and mutual repulsion, but one which will perfect the Union, fuse the Judicatures, and assimilate the laws of the two countries. If instead of destroying the Irish Church and the rights of property, Mr. Gladstone had abolished the separate administrations, such as those of the Lord-Lieutenant and Chief Secretary for Ireland, he would, in our judgment, have done far more to pacify and enrich that unhappy country.

THE Leicester Church Congress was an unqualified success from beginning to end. This was due in a measure to the lavish hospitality of the townspeople, in which the Nonconformists vied with Churchmen, but chiefly to the admirable tact and business-like manner with which all the meetings were conducted. The Bishop of Peterborough proved a model President, moderating the debates and controlling the proceedings of the largest and most threatening meetings with great judgment and strong good sense. His very eloquent addresses were listened to with profound silence, except when interrupted by burst of enthu-

siastic applause. Our readers had an opportunity last week of estimating the masterly Opening Address. The Closing Oration on the reception of the address for the Noncomformist Ministers was equally eloquent, and perhaps shewed a stronger grasp of the subject he had in hand. We were glad to see that he plainly cautioned the Dissenting Ministers as to the use they made of their newly-acquired rights in our churchyards.

LEICESTER CHURCH CONGRESS.

INTERNAL UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

By the EARL OF CARNARVON.

I have, to my great regret, been prevented by an early departure from England, which has altered all my plans, from attending and taking personal part in the subject of discussion; but I propose in the following paper briefly to indicate some of those considerations which, had I been present, I should have endeavoured to enforce. I shall not touch upon the theological aspect of the question beyond this—that, assuming always a loyal belief in the supernatural facts and the cardinal doctrines of revealed religion, the three great parties in the Church have legitimate functions to discharge; that each of them represents a true principle, and that all in combination are necessary to the Inclusiveness and the active life of the Church. With this assumption I prefer to cast my few observations into as practical a form as possible; and for the sake of clearness I will lay down two propositions of a very homely nature, and will follow them up by three inferences of the same kind. They are not new; but if true they are not the worse for having been said before. My first proposition, then, is that on the whole, and fairly considered these three great parties enjoy within the pale of the Church of England, some of them more, some of them less, but all of them considerable freedom. Each in turn complains as they become conscious of restraint, each one is subject to occasional disadvantages or hardships, and each will in such circumstances probably take exception to my proposition; but, on the whole, I know no other Church where, assuming always that the essential limits of spiritual truth are not invaded, so much liberty of thought and action exist. My second proposition is, that never in the life of a single generation have changes so large and so much debated been accomplished with so much ultimate acquiescence by the various opposing parties. Let those whose memory carries them back to the great revival of Church life in Oxford more than forty years ago recall the bitter and apparently irreconcilable controversies which divided congregations and set households at variance, not so much on doctrinal differences as respecting matters essentially of form—the use of the surplice in the pulpit, the length and character of the services, the use of hymns and choral service, the ornamentation of churches, and such-like—and let them compare the feeling and state of things then and now. Can they deny that a change amounting to a revolution has been accomplished amid many risks, often amid bitter contention, but yet without material injury to the structure and fair fabric of that Church which was called by one of her most eloquent divines the "glory of the Reformation, the surest bulwark of Protestantism, and the express image of the purest antiquity?" And do they not recognise in this the old saying that all things come to him who knows how to wait? Do they not see that the natural drift of events and of English thought will, if they have but patience, accomplish much, if not all, that they desire? Vast, therefore, as this change has been, changes as great are probably before us. All round us the signs of the times indicate the transitional, and almost revolutionary, phase through which we are passing; but, to use an ancient illustration, the Church, like the moon, wanes for a time only to wax afterwards in size and splendour, and our wisdom just now, I am convinced, consists rather in watching and waiting upon events, and in accommodating ourselves to them, than in attempting to anticipate or to force them. Such, then, being the facts, what are the inferences to be drawn from them? First, let us not fall into the error of undervaluing what we have because we cannot get all that we want. The work which is doing at home—in country parishes, in crowded towns, by missions to low populations, by fearless argument with every form of educated unbelief—the resurrection of a long-buried and well-nigh inanimate Convocation, the relations of an almost patriarchal headship growing up between the Church at home and her hundred daughters on Anglo-Saxon soil abroad—all these are, in great measure, due to the faith, liberality, and self-devotion of Churchmen. But a large proportion also of this work can only be done by an Established and endowed Church. Let us not deceive ourselves on this vital point. There may be compensations to be found in a Church untrammelled by the State, though Cavour's favourite idea of a "free Church in a free State" has never yet, in his sense, passed from the region of words to that of fact. Perhaps even the stream of individual liberality would be quickened by the loss of State support, but the blow to the daily work of the Church would be in some respects irreparable. The Church of England would probably become more and more the Church of the wealthy and respectable, and many of the poorest and lowest of our population would cease to hear the Gospel. Let not, therefore, any one dream that in substituting a voluntary for an Established Church they can escape the greatest of national calamities. The Colonial Churches, with their comparatively small populations, and the vast resources of those young communities, present wholly different conditions; while in the United States many of their best Churchmen marvel to see the hot impatience with which some of us are ready to sacrifice the incalculable advantages which we now possess. My second inference, addressed, perhaps, to a different school, is that none but the most short-sighted will look to legislation as a remedy for our present difficulties. There are some who fancy that there is virtue in an Act of Parliament, and who, on the chance of the Act being drawn in their favour, would embrace it, and would even clamour for it. But the conditions of Parliament, as now constituted, are incapable of wise and just legislation on Church questions; there is scarcely a line on this subject in the statue-book of recent years which would not be better out than in it, and whatever our difficulties, and even our contentions, the less we have of Parliamentary interposition the happier we shall be. And my third and last inference is the often reiterated moral, in which all will agree, but which few will observe—that we should exercise somewhat more forbearance towards each other in the necessary differences which must characterise the relations of a Church so comprehensive as ours. And this on grounds of worldly wisdom as much as of Christian charity. As between enemies or opponents, it is of course idle to preach forbearance;

but as between men who have common objects, whose common safety depends upon common action, and who are divided by differences which bear so small a proportion to the points of agreement, and which, as compared with the aggressive influencies of modern infidelity —must I not add of often virulent political antagonism? —are at least of a secondary order, their forbearance is a maxim of simple prudence. Let us at least neither magnify our disagreements by the acrimony of our controversies nor justify the sneer of the historian, that, like the Greeks of Constantinople, we dispute over differences of form while the enemy is at our gates. No part of the Constitution of this ancient realm has shown a greater elasticity in accomodating itself to the changes of time than the Church of England; none a larger power in evolving fresh forces; none, even historically considered, a nobler record of literature, of intellect, of actual work achieved; and none, too, has so vast a field still open to it. Men have envied her grandeur and prophesied her fall; her foes go round her walls and mark her battlements; but temporal and religious assaults have alike fallen idle. No weapon that has been formed against her has prospered, and even the tongues that have risen against her have been condemned. But the true peril—none can doubt it—is from within, and if parties become factious, and they who should be our strength divide our household, that which neither the rivalry of Rome nor the opposition of Dissent, nor the ceaseless fret of political warfare, nor the bitter hatred of atheistic philosophy could effect—

> Quod neque Tydides nec Larissæus Achilles,
> Non anni domuere decem, non mille carinæ—

our own dissensions may bring to pass. And, therefore, to sum up my practical conclusion in a few words, it is for all parties in the Church, but especially for the Bishops, to recognise the distinct, and, as I hold, the legitimate schools of thought which exist among us, and with a generous construction of motives, and a liberal exercise of the discretion happily entrusted to them, to give free and fair play to different congregations and parties in the practice and externals of divine worship. The man has outgrown the clothes of the child, and the strict uniformity which was once perhaps desirable and even necessary, is, under our altered conditions, no longer possible. But by some sacrifice of uniformity substantial unity may be secured; and by the lessening of friction—to use an illustration not unsuited to the circumstances of a manufacturing town—the manifold and complex machinery of our lives as Churchmen and citizens may be made to work for the common weal.

DURHAM DIOCESAN CONFERENCE.

(Concluded from page 477.)

"I have left to the last a subject which stands first on our programme, as it is also first in intrinsic importance—I mean the division of the diocese.

"When the question was stirred some little time ago my predecessor consulted the clergy through the ruri-decanal chapters as to the expediency of such a measure, I cannot do better than give the result in Bishop Baring's own words:—'Whilst there was much difference of opinion,' he writes in his last Charge, 'as to the sources from whence the endowment should be obtained and the amount of that endowment, the judgment was almost unanimous as to the desirableness of the creation of a new See. It was not to be expected,' he adds, 'that in arriving at this conclusion many of the clergy of Northumberland should not feel much regret at the prospect of a separation from the ancient See of Durham, with which they had been associated for so many years, but they were found willing to sacrifice their personal feelings and predilections in order to forward an object which seemed so manifestly calculated to advance the best interests of our northern Church.' At the same time the Bishop 'states the reasons which induce him to think that a division of the diocese is much needed.' I think it right to emphasise this fact, because there seems to be an impression abroad that my predecessor was either averse to the measure or reluctantly yielded his assent. His own words show that he supported it from deliberate conviction. Thus the Bishop and clergy were at one.

"All that self-denying zeal, long experience, and exceptional business capacities could do, Bishop Baring had done. But a diocese which extends for more than a hundred miles from North to South, and comprises many more than a million of human beings—a diocese widely heterogeneous in its character, including the extensive and sparsely inhabited parishes under the Cheviots on the one hand, and the thronged seaports and pit villages of Durham, with their dense and growing population on the other; a diocese, moreover, presenting exceptional difficulties owing to the rapid aggregations of people at its chief centres, and the sudden changes in the distribution of its masses—had far outgrown any one man's capacities. It was quite impossible that any Bishop, however energetic, could exercise due supervision and influence over so large an area under circumstances so adverse. Accordingly provision was made under the Bishoprics Act of 1878 for the creation of a new See of Newcastle in pursuance of this almost unanimous desire of the clergy, and with the entire concurrence of the Bishop himself.

"When I accepted the See of Durham it was represented to me that the formation of the new See was imminent; and this expectation weighed greatly with me. When, therefore, I entered the diocese, I seized the first opportunity to emphasise this measure as one which should engage our immediate attention. But the moment was represented to me as inopportune. Everything was against us. Agriculture was in a deplorable condition. Commerce was at its lowest ebb. The mineral trade more especially, on which the diocese is largely dependent, was fearfully depressed. Moreover, the evil resulting from the state of the market was aggravated beyond measure by chronic strikes, which not only inflicted heavy losses in themselves, but paralysed industry and enterprise by creating a general sense of insecurity. I do not know whether I acted rightly. Perhaps a bolder venture of faith would have been better. But I was afraid to endanger a measure of so great importance by a false start. I deferred to these representations, and I held my hands for the time. But I have never wavered in my own mind as to the importance of the measure in itself.

"I should add, also, that my own position was a serious impediment in the way of active measures at first. My hands were too full to give much time and attention to the matter, while I was still learning the work of the diocese. Where localities are unfamiliar and men are unknown, a very small matter of business, which might otherwise have been transacted in five minutes, may involve much correspondence and take up some hours, if it is properly done. Moreover, the vacancy of the See had left arrears of work. Thus, within seven months I had to hold confirmations for two years; and

without help from another Bishop on the first occasion I do not know how I should have got through the work. This was an additional reason for delay. I must, indeed look to the exertions of others to carry this enterprise through. I trust that these northern counties will furnish zealous laymen who will do for the diocese of Newcastle what zealous laymen have done for the diocese of Liverpool; who by steadfastness of purpose and untiring personal exertions will wrest a speedy victory out of circumstances. They will stand in a far more advantageous position than myself or my clergy for pressing the measure forward. To their hands I must commit its success. But meanwhile, in its initiatory stages it was necessary that I should act myself.

"If the importance of the measure is once realised, the financial question ought to present no difficulty. We start with far greater advantages than any other See created under the recent act. The *minimum* endowment required by the act is £3,500. This requirement, however, is reduced at once by £1,000, which will be withdrawn from the annual income of the present Bishop of Durham and his successors, as soon as the See is founded. The remaining income of £2,500 per annum is represented by a capital sum of £62,500, say £63,000, the interest being calculated at 4 per cent. Of this £63,000, however, the bequest of Mr. Hedley, with its accumulations up to the present time, amounts to about £18,000—a sum which is already in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and bearing interest. Thus the whole amount required to be raised by subscriptions is reduced to £45,000. But of this sum more than £18,000 have been paid or promised already. These contributions have been volunteered in almost every instance; and in no case has there been anything like solicitation. Moreover, the whole, with the exception of £500, has been contributed by six donors alone, including the munificent contribution of £10,000 from the Duke of Northumberland. Thus, while the amount remaining to be raised is not more than £26,000 or £27,000, almost the whole field of contributing power still remains unworked. Is there any ground for despondency in these facts?

"But, it may be said, £27,000 is a large sum after all, and there are other crying wants which cannot be disregarded. There is the great city of Newcastle itself, with its densely-thronged parishes, numbering in some cases from fifteen to twenty thousand human beings, with its ill-paid incumbencies, with its inadequate staff of curates, with its thousands and tens of thousands living and dying without any true knowledge of God in Christ, with its fearful tale of misery and crime. I know this; and it is just because I know and feel it strongly that I urge the measure upon you. Do you believe—I do not—that if Newcastle had been created into a See twenty years ago, the state of things as regards spiritual ministrations would have remained what it is now? I am not indulging in *á priori* assumptions as to the effects of such a measure. Look at Manchester. See what a difference the bishopric—now a little more than thirty years old—has made and is making in the life of the Church there. I venture to say that if such another as the Bishop of Manchester were settled at Newcastle, armed with the authority and the opportunities of the Episcopal office, you would see in a very few years a change which would gladden all hearts. Look again at an example of another kind—no longer a diocese studded with densely thronged manufacturing towns, but a diocese made up of scattered rural and mining populations. See what is going on in Truro—a diocese of only three years' standing under my dear friend and old schoolfellow, Bishop Benson. Mark how everywhere the dry bones are awakening and starting up into new life. The Church of England has inherited Episcopacy as its form of government from the ripened wisdom of the Apostolic age. But the Episcopate, to be efficient, must be adequate. The very constitution of our Church is such that no other agency can supply the defect. It is not only an office of supervision; it has also its direct personal ministrations. This two-fold character it is which makes it so important to secure an adequate Episcopate. I have no words but words of thankfulness, when I hear of the efforts of noble-hearted and open-handed men to supply the spiritual needs of any particular locality. They will always command my deepest sympathy and most cordial aid. But I say that, if you would attack the evil in a spirit of true generalship, you will begin at once at the other end. Only plant a Bishop in Newcastle, face to face with the spiritual destitution of the place, and I am much surprised if, before two or three years are past, some comprehensive and well-considered scheme for its amendment is not devised. A centre of spiritual authority and of ecclesiastical direction is wanted, round which the zeal of Churchmen—laity as well as clergy—may rally; for there is no lack of zeal in either. I appeal confidently to the experience of our Church everywhere, at home and abroad, in the colonies and among the heathen. The people of Liverpool have been wise in their generation. They have seen their need, and have come forward with prompt and open hand. I shall be disappointed indeed if, under their zealous and energetic first Bishop, the wisdom of their generosity is not entirely vindicated. The first Bishop in whose consecration I was called to take a part was the Bishop of Liverpool. It is my earnest hope and prayer that the second may be the Bishop of Newcastle.

"I have said that I have never wavered in my opinion; but I cannot say that I have never entertained any passing regrets. I trust I am the last person to undervalue grand historic memories. The truest aspirations in the present are built upon the noble associations of the past. The Church of Christ more especially is typified by a temple raised layer upon layer, each part dependent upon the other for the symmetry and stability of the whole. Our sentimental feelings must necessarily receive a deep wound from the partition of this ancient diocese. I know that this feeling is felt by many in Northumberland, I reciprocate it most sincerely myself. It will be a consolation to both to feel that the regret in parting is mutual. If it costs Northumberland a pang to separate from the great See of Durham with its magnificent cathedral, and its nine centuries of historic tradition, the Bishop and diocese of Durham will feel not less regret in relinquishing the largest and fairest portion of their inheritance, and with it the cradle of the See—the birthplace of Christianity in northern England, the Iona of the Eastern shores—the Holy Island which is rich with the memories of Aidan and Cuthbert. But, if this be, as I believe it to be, a measure of the highest moment, bound up with the best interests of the Church of Christ in these northern counties; then no sentiments or feelings, however sacred, must be allowed to stand in its way. Historical association and local attachments were intended to be stepping-stones; we must not convert them into barriers. When once historic sentiment flings itself across the path of an urgent practical need, then away with it in the name of God. We shall plead in vain some lingering regret over a waning past, as an excuse for holding

back. The voice of a higher authority is heard summoning us forward on the path of a larger future. 'Let the dead bury their dead.'—dead traditions, dead historic associations, the dead past in all its forms—'and follow thou Me.'

"One solution, however, is suggested, which would do no violence to these traditions and feelings. The expedient of a Suffragan is not new in the diocese of Durham, though for nearly three centuries the office has lain in abeyance. In pre-Reformation times it is by no means uncommon to stumble on the name of a person who acted in this capacity either temporarily or for life. Almost coeval with the Reformation was the well-known Act of Henry VIII., which, after lying dormant for many generations, has been revived in the cases of Dover, Nottingham, Southwark, and Bedford. In this Act provision is made for a Suffragan-Bishop of Berwick, who was to act under the Bishop of Durham, and on one occasion—in Queen Elizabeth's reign—this provision was put into force in the person of one Thomas Sparke, who was also a master of Greatham Hospital. From that time forward, so far as I am aware, there has been no Bishop of Berwick. This solution would be easy if it were satisfactory. On this point it is well to speak frankly. If I were to consult my own convenience, I should take steps at once for the appointment of a Suffragan, and postpone the division of the diocese *sine die*. I should certainly get more relief in this way; for the effect of dividing the diocese will not be, I apprehend, to reduce the work of the Bishop of Durham very materially; but to enable him to do his work more thoroughly. But I do not think the expedient satisfactory. A Suffragan-Bishop holds a very anomalous position. It is the direct personal responsibility which makes the man in himself. It is the independent personal authority which recommends him to others. The Suffragan-Bishop has neither. He cannot feel his own strength, and he cannot make it felt by others. Thus, by no fault of his own, but by the force of circumstances, he is less efficient than he should be. He may perform certain Episcopal acts as well as or better than the Diocesan; but, from the mere fact that he is not the Diocesan, they do not meet with the same acceptance. As a centre of corporate activity he is almost powerless. Under this conviction I have taken no steps for the appointment of a Suffragan, fearing thereby to inflict an injury on the Church by the postponement of the creation of the new See. Notwithstanding the sacrifice of influence and income which it will involve, I shall hold it the brightest day of my Episcopate when Newcastle asserts her independence; and I am not without the hope that to-day may prove the beginning of the end.

"With these opening words I commend our deliberations to Almighty God, praying that He will overrule and guide them to the glory of His Name and the welfare of the Church of Christ."

WHAT THE CHURCH OF IRELAND OWES TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND FOR BISHOP BEDELL.

By the Rev. COURTENAY MOORE, M.A.

William Bèdell was born in the county of Essex, in England, in a village called Black-Notley, upon Michaelmas Day, 1571. Queen Elizabeth was then reigning monarch. His family it is said were of ancient continuance in the county, but not of high rank; his father and grandfather being yeomen. His mother like the mothers of all eminent men had something remarkable about her; in her case it was skill in surgery, which it is said she practised gratis upon multitudes who flocked to her, both rich and poor. And it is said it happened sometimes that some would return like the healed Samaritan with some token of thankfulness, but this was seldom. It seems strange that a lady should practise surgery, but perhaps the writer of the ancient record from which I have taken this did not mean to imply that she performed surgical operations, but only administered some favourite remedies for coughs or colds, which had acquired a local reputation—surgery in the reign of Elizabeth was doubtless at a very imperfect stage when practised even by the most qualified operators, and it is to be hoped for the sake of the community who consulted Mrs. Bèdell, that she confined herself to the prescription of simples. William, who was the second son, very early showed excellent parts and a studious disposition. He was educated at Braintree in Essex, and though so promising a pupil was treated with great severity by his teacher. On one occasion he received from him such a violent blow that he subsequently quite lost the hearing of one ear from it. At the wonderfully early age of eleven years he was sent to the University of Cambridge, and not long after his admission was chosen scholar of Emanuel College. He pursued his studies with great diligence at Cambridge, giving his attention chiefly to languages, for the acquisition of which he had a special facility. After his ordination his first call to the work of the ministry was in the town of Bury St. Edmunds, in Suffolk. Here he continued for about a year, when he went to Venice as chaplain to Sir Henry Wotton, the English Ambassador. What passed during his residence at Venice would in itself furnish a very interesting subject of inquiry, but as it belongs rather to the class of "burning questions" I pass it over, merely observing that while there Bèdell became intimately acquainted with the celebrated father, Paul Sarpi, the historian of the Council of Trent, and remarkable also for the prominent part he played in Venice during the pontificate of Paul the Vth.

Returning again to Bury St. Edmunds, the next noticeable point in the life of Bèdell was his marriage. The object of his choice was a widow, Mrs. Leah Maw, who, it is said, "had five small children and but a small estate." After his marriage he continued for some years longer at Bury St. Edmunds, but his church being very large and his voice weak he found it desirable to exchange to a country parish in the same neighbourhood, which in this respect was more suitable for him. As a parochial clergyman in both of these cures he appears to have been most efficient, and greatly beloved and valued by his people. Some interesting particulars are given of his style of preaching and manner of discharging other ministerial duties, *e.g.*, "His voice was but low, his action little: but the gravity of his aspect very great, and the reverence of his behaviour such as was more affecting to the hearers than the greater eloquence of others." "In the handling of his text no man in his time was more exact, whether in opening, the coherence, or the words themselves." "Besides his sermons, forenoon and afternoon, he used to catechize the youth openly in the face of the congregation, whom he instructed not only to answer in the words of the Catechism, but also to answer such other material questions as might make them understand the

principles of religion." In one respect he was very unlike the pastor in the deserted village, whose

> "House was known to all the vagrant train,
> He chid the wanderings but relieved their pain."

With respect to the beggars, bedlams and travellers that use to come to men's doors; these he would not fail to examine, mixing both wholesome instructions and severe reproofs, and would send for the constable. . . This made him so well-known among that sort of people that they shunned the town, for the most part to the no small quiet and security of him and all his neighbours.

I confess I admire Goldsmith's village pastor here much more than Mr. Bèdell, and though it may be contrary to the principles of the "Dismal science," there is after all a good deal of Christian feeling in the advice of Charles Lamb. "Reader," he says in one of his charming essays, "do not be frightened at the hard words, imposition, imposture, give and ask no questions. 'Cast thy bread upon the waters.' Some have unawares entertained angels. Shut not thy purse strings always against painted distress. Act a charity sometimes. When a poor creature outwardly and visibly such comes before thee, do not stay to inquire whether the seven small children, in whose name he implores thy assistance, have a veritable existence. Rake not into the bowels of unwelcome truth to save a half-penny. It is good to believe him."

We now come to the portion of the history of Bèdell which for the first time connects him with this country. The Provostship of Trinity College, Dublin, becoming vacant in 1627, the Fellows, under the advice of Archbishop Usher, unanimously invited him to accept the post. After much consideration he gave up his "competent living of above £100 a-year in a good air and seat, with a very convenient house near to my friends, a little parish not exceeding the compass of my weak voice." In a monetary point of view he seems to have gained little or nothing by his promotion; for his yearly stipend as Provost was only £100, to which he had £20 per annum added for preaching a lecture every fortnight at Christ Church; and this was the utmost of his revenue. Making every allowance for the greater value of money in the reign of Charles I. than now, such an income was indeed small. But the University was then only in its infancy. Provost Bèdell made a number of rules or statutes for the College, which are called Bèdell's statutes to this day. Some of these referred to the attendance of the Fellows and students at divine service; and the following statute concerning "Commons" may be noticed as interesting. It was provided that always before dinner and supper in the hall, the scholars of the house in their turn, every one his week, were to read a chapter in the Latin Bible and then give thanks; and after meat was brought in and a little space of time allowed, the reader was to go up to the Fellows' table, where the Provost was nearly always present, and there recite some verse of the chapter that was read, to give occasion for profitable discussion. There is now no supper in the dining-hall, the only meal at which the students and Fellows meet being dinner. There is still the Fellows' table, as there was in Provost Bèdell's time, and the students dine at separate tables, each class having its own. The scholars still say a Latin grace; but there is no reading of a chapter from the Bible. This custom still exists in monasteries; one of the community, who is called the hebdomodary priest, reading from the Bible or some religious work to his brethren during meal-time in the Refectory.

Bèdell held the office of Provost of Trinity for a very short time, something about two years; when, without solicitation or even thought of such promotion, he was made Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh. Writing to Dr. Despotine on the subject he says:—"Thus your friend, who never desired or dreamed of this or any other Bishopric more than to be Pope of Rome, is to have two Bishoprics at a clap, being insufficient for one." His sufficiency for the office, however, was soon made apparent by the results of his administration of it. He was consecrated Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh in St. Peter's Church, Drogheda, on September 13th, 1629, by the celebrated Primate Usher and the Bishops of Down, Dromore and Clogher. In dealing with this portion of his life I omit a number of circumstances not by any means in themselves unimportant, for they show the immense difficulties he had all along to contend against; but there is only time to deal in a more general way with the subject. When he came to the diocese it was said of it that "it was breathing out the last spirit." In his life, written by his son, who speaks with the authority of an eye-witness, it is stated—"The reader must know there were not five churches in his whole diocese, but all were ruined so as scarcely the walls were standing in some places. Such was the state of the fabrics. Pluralism and Non-Residence were open and crying evils, both of which the Bishop set himself to eradicate. As the parishes became vacant he made it a rule never to bestow more than one on one man; and he required an oath of all his nominees to be perpetually and personally resident within their cures. He was in the habit of saying, with reference to the overwhelming Roman Catholic population around them—"Though the people would not hear them preach, yet it was very fit they should see their good conversation;" and therefore by no means would he allow non-residence or pluralities. He himself before long resigned the Bishopric of Ardagh, retaining only that of Kilmore; saying that "it was an unreasonable thing of him to seek to reform heapers of benefices, being himself faulty in having two bishoprics." In addition to re-building the churches and reforming the abuses of Pluralism and Non-Residence in his diocese, Bishop Bèdell undertook and accomplished, with assistance, the translation of the whole Bible into Irish. His principal assistants in this work were by name Murtagh King and James Nangle; and it was finished, says his biographer, "and fair written ready for the press before that dismal time of trouble, rebuke, and blasphemy, wherein God called His faithful servant to Himself." The reference here is to the terrible scenes which were witnessed in Ireland when the war, which began in 1641, broke out. Before proceeding to consider as briefly as possible the Bishop's trials during this terrible period, the following notice of the county in which he resided, as it then was in the Seventeenth Century, may be interesting.

"And here," says his biographer, "the reader must be entreated to understand a little the quality of the country where the Bishop's seat was, and what neighbours he lived among. His house was situate in the County of Cavan, in the Province of Ulster, in Ireland, in a country consisting altogether of hills very steep and high; the valleys between being most commonly bogs and loughs. The country was then mostly well-planted with English, but scatteringly here and there, which facilitated their ruin. The only considerable town in the whole county was Belturbet, which yet was but as one of our market towns here in England, having but only one church in it. This town was seven miles

distant from the Bishop's house. Kilmore itself was but a mere country village, so thinly inhabited that nowhere in the whole parish any street, or part of a street, was to be found. There was a competent number of English, but the Irish were more than five times their number. The Bishop's house joined close to the church, being built upon one of the highest hills in the country." With regard to what now follows I desire to say that I refer to it solely because so instructive and principal a part of the Bishop's life is necessarily mixed up with it. There is much in the past history of our country that all parties should try to forgive and forget, and I would not willingly say a word to revive unhappy memories.

Saturday, the 23rd of October, 1641, had been the day fixed throughout Ireland for a national rising in arms. But for about a fortnight after this date Bishop Bèdell had no experience beyond reports coming in of what was occurring in the country. By that time, however, a great number of English had begun to fly for shelter to his house; regarding it as a haven of refuge. He and a number of these refugees remained in his house until about Christmas. The house being close to the church they enjoyed the consolations of religion in their time of trouble, and there is something very affecting in the account of the Bishop's then preaching to his little flock from the words: "But Thou, O Lord, art a shield for me, my glory and the lifter up of my head. I laid me down and slept; I awaked for the Lord sustained me. I will not be afraid of ten thousands of the people that have set themselves against me round about." Most of those who sought refuge with the Bishop eventually reached Dublin in safety; he himself declined to leave his post. About this time he and his family were removed by Mr. Edmund O'Reilly to Loughoughter Castle as prisoners, in consequence of a brother of this gentleman having been made prisoner by two Scotch knights, who still held out two castles against the insurgents. He was not, however, treated with severity during this imprisonment, and not long after, there being an exchange of prisoners, he was set at liberty. The comparative gentleness and consideration with which he was treated was owing to the great respect which the excellence of his character had gained for him. He was not allowed to return to his own house, but was permitted to reside with the Rev. Dennis Sheridan, one of his own clergy, a member of an old and powerful Cavan family, who, for this reason, had been exempted from the sufferings of the period. By the care of this clergyman, the Bishop's MS. Hebrew Bible was preserved, and is now, according to the Bishop's last will and testament, in the library of Emanuel College, Cambridge. As for the rest of his library, "the Bishop's books," says his biographer, 'went every way but the right; and some of his sermons were preached in Dublin, and heard there by some of Bishop Bèdell's near relations that had formerly heard them from his own mouth, and some of the Episcopal order were not innocent in this case."

After a residence of some weeks in the house of Mr. Sheridan, the Bishop was seized with a violent and continued fever. During his illness he was visited by Mr. Philip O'Reilly, brother of the gentleman who had imprisoned him, who besought him if he wanted money or any other necessaries, to make use of anything that he was able to furnish him with. The Bishop thanked him for his great civility, desiring God to requite him for the same. But his end was now near, and we must feel that for himself, he required no corruptible things such as silver and gold, for he was about to pass to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, that fadeth not away. He blessed and comforted his weeping family, and his last words were: "Be of good cheer; be of good cheer; whether we live or die we are the Lord's."

Mr. Edmund O'Reilly, who had imprisoned him, attended his funeral with a party of soldiers, and, being come to the grave, his son, the sheriff of the county, told the Bishop's sons they might use what prayers or form of burial they pleased, none should interrupt them. Military honours were then paid to his remains by the soldiers. A Roman Catholic Priest who was present was heard to say "may *my* soul be with Bèdell," and, according to some accounts, others exclaimed, "may he rest in peace, the last of the English." In accordance with his own request, the Bishop was buried in a corner of the churchyard of Kilmore; his grave is still to be seen shaded by a sycamore, said to have been planted by his own hands. The new Cathedral Church of Kilmore, consecrated in 1860, was, according to the inscription thereon, erected to his memory. *Truly* "The memory of the just is blessed," and "The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance." "We bless Thy Holy Name, O Lord, for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear; beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom."

The Bishop of St. Asaph delivered on Monday last his triennial Charge in the cathedral. His lordship adverted to the increased difficulties of the clergy in Wales, owing to the existence of two living languages side by side. Although the children could best understand religious ideas in their native tongue, he believed they must learn English to get on in life. Speaking on the Burials Act, his lordship said that now the long-standing dispute was settled, the clergy would find that they had not lost much, for all their former legal rights in churchyards still remained, except the prevention of funerals without the Church of England services. He had voted for the Bill because he foresaw immense difficulties to their beloved Church if that concession were not made. He would counsel them, while maintaining their legal rights, to accept the Act, and carry it out in a Christian spirit, and not raise needless objections themselves, but realise their high position as parochial clergymen.

———:o:———

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE "WORDSWORTH MEMORIAL" FUND.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—I was glad to see a copy of the circular issued through the medium of a Supplement to your Journal, appears in the general issue for last week; which may be regarded as a "Congress Number," seeing it so largely deals with subjects discussed *at* the Congress. I imagine, however, that other Clergy, beside those of Lichfield and *Lincoln*, received copies, though with regard to the latter diocese, as the Bishop of Lincoln is about to issue a pastoral on behalf of the New Bishopric Fund, it was thought best not to issue the circular before the Bishop's pastoral appeared. Nevertheless of all the large number of copies of this appeal which were sent out through the post, in the week before

and that during the Congress, I have only had one copy returned, and that was *re-directed.*

The Dioceses—I should here explain—in which the Honorary Local Secretaries are actually working, those, viz., Exeter, Norwich, Peterboro', and York, have been provided for through their county prints; our recent effort was confined to supplying the Congress-Goers and the clergy of the neighbouring Dioceses of Lichfield and *Peterboro'* with copies of the Circular, and the list of subscriptions — certainly the latter begins to look satisfactory.

G. E. WATKINS, Hon. Sec.

—:o:—

THE "WORDSWORTH MEMORIAL."

[FROM A CORRESPONDENT.]

This movement met with much encouragement and support at the Church Congress, at Leicester, last week, several well-known and influential laymen having there expressed their sympathy with it, and their desire to lend what assistance lay in their power. This will not only give the movement a fresh start, but it is likely to call attention to the vast mass of talent and unsuspected feeling existing amongst the Church Laity, with regard to the hardships imposed upon a most loyal body of Christians in this country, viz., the clergy, by the Burials Act. For it seems to have been forgotten that each individual member of the Church has feelings as susceptible, and principles as earnestly contended for, as the members of any other Christian body of Englishmen. A gathering of Churchmen like that at Leicester, afforded a seasonable and convenient opportunity for giving expression to their views upon this hasty measure, and as one means of manifesting their sense of the injudicious policy of those who were mainly instrumental in procuring the passing of the Act, many took the opportunity of renewing the expression of their hearty gratitude to the one prominent opponent of the measure, viz., the Bishop of Lincoln. And on the other hand, the opportunity was too good to be lost of calling attention to statements that have recently appeared in the public prints, as to the means by which a compromise was effected between the original promoters of the Burials Bill who now hold office and those institutions and individuals whose first duty it was apparently if not their "raison d'etre," to have met the measure with a firm and unhesitating "non possumus." On such matters as surrendering a trust, much caution and consideration seem demanded from the trustees, and when, as in the present case, others are entitled to be consulted, it seems a pity that the opportunity should have been afforded only *after* the concessions had actually been made, and even then only indirectly, by those concerned turning to account an assembly of Clergy and Church Laity gathered together for another object, at such stray fragments of time as might fall out of the President's "Time Tables," so to speak. It gives to any independent and unsolicited expressions of opinion on such an occasion as this two-fold weight, that first no notice of such discussions had been officially issued, and secondly that the arrangements for eliciting such discussions should have been made so successfully under the disadvantage of having to contend with other prior arrangements to which a large staff of Clergy and Laymen had been for months previously devoting their attention. Amongst these incidental measures concerted for the purpose of placing on record the feeling of the whole body of faithful Churchmen towards a noble benefactor, may be reckoned the movement for promoting the "Wordsworth Memorial" Fund, and it is significant of the strength of the under-current of opinion that the promoters of this Fund should have had but to place in the hands of those attending the Congress—in the shape of a Supplement to a weekly Journal—a list of the Committee and of the subscriptions already received, to call forth such warm and hearty expressions of opinion in favour of the movement as were spontaneously afforded by such trusted—because tried and proved—"Defenders of the Faith" as Earl Nelson, Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P., and Francis Sharpe Powell, Esq. That during Congress week, no less than six influential men—three dignitaries of the Church and three eminent Laymen—should have promised to lend the Committee any help in their power is a fact which speaks for itself, and one that may well encourage Bishop Wordsworth's Memorialists to thank God and take courage.

—:o:—

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Boniface, Rev. Thomas, vicar of Deddington; Surrogate.
Claughton, Rev. Piers Leopold, rector of Hutton, Essex.
Garratt, Rev. W. J., vicar of Gannon, Burnley.
Hanmer, Rev. Edmund Calvert, curate of Fillongley.
Hardy-Little, Rev. Charles organising secretary of the Additional Curates' Society; chaplain to the English Church of St. Petersburg.
Henderson, Rev. John, vicar of Ashampstead, Berks.
Inge, Rev. W., vicar of Alrewas; examining chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield.
Lennard, Rev. D. B., curate of Hodnet; rector of Aldham, Suffolk.
Lester, Rev. John Moore, vicar of Stoney Stratford, Bucks.
Lyttleton, Hon. and Rev. W. H., hon. canon of Worcester, and rector of Hagley; canon of Gloucester Cathedral.
Mansfield, Rev. A., vicar of Shirehampton; vicar of Elberton.
Massey, Rev. Edwyn Reynolds, vicar of Merton, Oxon.
Penney, Rev. W. H., vicar of Northmoor; organising secretary of the Universities' Mission of Central Africa.
Penny, Rev. E. L., chaplain to H.M. Dockyard and Hospital, Bermuda; chaplain to H.M. Land Forces on Boaz and Ireland Islands.
Roberts, Rev. Griffith, vicar of Llanegryn, and head master of Llanegryn Grammar School; rector of Dowlais.
Sullivan, Rev. Charles Edward, late curate of Astbury; vicar of St. Michael, Hulme Walfield, Cheshire.
Symonds, Rev. G. Davey, late chaplain to H.M. Forces in India; rector of Coryton, Devon.

—:o:—

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barlow, Rev. John James, at Kempsford Vicarage, vicar of Kempsford, hon. canon of Bristol, rural dean of Fairford, and chaplain to the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, on the 27th ult., aged 64.
Clarke, Rev. Henry, at Northfield Rectory, on the 2nd inst., aged 75.
Gent, Rev. R. A., at Llandovery, South Wales, after five years of lingering paralysis, on the 1st inst., aged 60.
Howlett, Rev. Thomas Lea, B.D., at the Vicarage, Lambeth-road, vicar of St. Paul's, Westminster-bridge-road, Southwark, on the 3rd inst., aged 54.
Page, Rev. Douglas, at 29, Ladbroke-square, rector of Sibstone, Leicestershire, and late Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, on the 26th ult., aged 44.
Pigot, Rev. John Clare, B.A., at the Priory, Taunton, of St. John's College, Cambridge, on the 2nd inst., aged 71.
Robinson, Rev. Aleaxnder, M.A., at Naini-Tal, killed by the landslip, Trinity College, Dublin, a senior chaplain on the India Eastablishment and of Moradabad, on the 18th ult.
Shepherd, Rev. Sidney Amherst, at Cairn House, Warwick-bridge, Carlisle, formerly incumbent of St. Paul's Church, Holme Eden, aged 70.
Waddington, Rev. John, D.D., at 9, Surrey-square, London, on the 24th ult., aged 69.
Williams, Rev. James, M.A., at Kenilworth, vicar of Camberwell, on the 11th ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE BARREN FIG TREE.

By the Rev. ARTHUR L. LLOYD, M.A.,
Vicar of Aylesbury.

Sermon Preached at St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday Evening, September 12th, 1880.

"And on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany, He was hungry; and seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, He came, if haply He might find any thing thereon: and when He came to it, He found nothing but leaves; for the time of figs was not yet. And Jesus answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever."—St. Mark xi. 12–14.

IN thinking of this miraculous parable (for it was a parable in a miracle) we shall not do amiss if we compare the account given us by St. Mark with that of St. Matthew. Both Evangelists relate the same events happening on Palm Sunday and the day following. Both tell of the triumphant entry into Jerusalem, of the cleansing of the Temple, of the cursing of the barren fig tree: yet they follow not the same order of time; and of the two we are left in no doubt as to which is the natural order. The *purpose* of St. Mark is clearly and definitely to leave an account of the events in the exact order in which they occurred. The children's hosannas; the day spent in the holy city; eventide drawing on; the retirement to Bethany; "and on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany," on the way to Jerusalem, the cursing of the fig tree; "and they come to Jerusalem;" and then follows the righteous indignation of the God of Love as He casts out of the House of Prayer the defilers of its courts; and again "when evening was come He went out of the city." All is told us here with an exactness which leaves us no room for doubt. And we thank God that it is so; for it helps us, as we try year by year to make the old picture live again before us, to trace the footsteps of the Man of Sorrows along the way of the Cross. But with St. Matthew it is different. *His* purpose, here as elsewhere in his Gospel story, is not the same. He takes but little account of the exact order of time; but seems to group together into one beautiful picture the incidents of each passage in our dear Lord's life, that he may so teach us better to know the character of the only true God, and of Jesus Christ whom He sent. You will notice that St. Matthew, without specifying any exact time, places the cleansing of the Temple between the triumphant entry and the cursing of the fig tree. Is there no meaning in this? May we not see in the grouping of these three events a Divine commentary on this one *solitary* miracle of judgment in the life of Him who came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them. I say solitary; for the destruction of the swine was rather by way of permission than of judgment. Does not St. Matthew seem to tell us by this very alteration in the order that these three are parts of one great picture declaring to us the character of God? and that in thinking of His character we may not separate one from the other. That He who wept over Jerusalem in love for the souls therein, that He who again in love, though in anger, drove the buyers and sellers from the Temple, and He who for the season cursed the fig tree, was all *one*. Oh, my brethren! when shall we cease creating a God out of our own selfish imaginations, conceiving for our own special benefit of a Being who will allow all manner of evil-doing on this His earth, who will suffer the innocent to perish through the wickedness of them that dwell therein, and yet forsooth will be so merciful as to permit the doers of all this villany, the makers of all this misery and mischief to go unpunished? When shall we be content to believe entirely and trust utterly in the God of the Bible? in One who could take little children up in His arms and bless them, and in the same breath could say, "Whoso shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." In One who loves truth and purity because He *is* Himself truth and purity, and therefore hates, and must hate, whatsoever worketh and maketh a lie. In One who is full of tenderness, compassion, long-suffering kindness towards the work of His hands, and therefore One who will by no means spare the guilty. Is not this the picture, think you, that the Evangelist would hold before us, and one of the lessons he would have us learn?

But let us for a while turn aside and mark this which is done to the fig tree, that we may, God helping us, gather from its fruitless branches a fruitful warning. Whatever secondary purposes this work may have effected, we may venture, without irreverence I hope, to surmise the thought which prompted it. "This tree is Israel!" Already had the parable been spoken: "A certain man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard: and he came and sought fruit thereon and found none. Then saith He unto the dresser of the vineyard, Behold these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree and find none: cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground? And he answerng said unto Him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it and dung it: and if it bear fruit, well: and if not, then after that Thou shalt cut it down." The miracle would almost seem to be the sequel of the parable. Again and again had He come unto His own, and His own had received Him not. He had done amongst them the works which none other had done, He had spoken words such as never man before had spoken: and they knew not, because they would not know, the time of their visitation. And yet mark the

reason of the curse. Our Lord saw from afar the fig tree because of its abundant foliage. The leaves attracted His attention because of the barrenness of those around them. At that time of the year it was no ordinary sight: "for the time of figs was not yet." But having leaves fruit might be expected; for in fig trees (in that country) it is well known that the fruit ripens before the leaves appear. The curse, then, was not given simply because there was no fruit, but because the show of leaves promised something extraordinary, and yet there was nothing beyond the rest. "This people draweth nigh unto Me with their mouth, and honoureth Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me." Therefore let no man eat fruit of thee! Thou hast had opportunities given thee: thou hast enjoyed privileges such as no other nation on earth. I chose thee from out of all nations to be My peculiar people. I gave thee earthly prosperity. With thee I made My covenant. To thee I entrusted the sacred deposit of My truth. With thee there rested the divinely appointed priesthood and the daily sacrifice. "I looked for righteousness and behold oppression: for judgment and behold a cry." "Ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers;" therefore the glory that might have been thine is taken from thee. Thou mightest have been for My salvation unto the ends of the world: but now thou shalt be trodden down of all nations, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled! It was not as we know a final curse. Would not our Lord seem to allude to this miracle in those after-words? "Behold the fig tree and all the trees: when they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand." May we venture in reverence to fancy that His eye was discerning through the ages the fulfilment of the times of the Gentiles? The budding again of the barren fig tree, and so the saving of all Israel? May God hasten it in His time! And the lesson for ourselves is not hard to find, my brethren. A warning surely is here for all nations and individuals, to whom God has given great privileges and corresponding reponsibilites! And who will deny that this has been granted to us without stint? Blessed with prosperity such as no other nation in the world has had! with wealth which none other could equal! with possessions in every quarter of the globe, "not because we were more in number than any people," but because the Lord our God cared for us. And what have we done? what do we? Boast of our advanced civilization, of the progress of science, of the wonderful inventions continually coming to light, the fruit of man's genius; and religious people will point to the stream of religious life; to great awakenings and revivals; to crowded congregations, hearty services. Leaves, my brethren, leaves; but what beneath? Where is truth? where is honesty among us? "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof" is engraved over the market place of England's commerce. Is this the principle, think you, that guides the transactions beneath its roof? Is it not simply true that dishonesty from the highest to the lowest is well-nigh an acknowledged fact in transacting business? Listen for a moment, my brethren, to what the world says of itself. I came across these words lately in an eminently worldly newspaper, in an article which attempted to review the past depression in trade, and to give a hopeful view of the future. "Now that the cotton mills of Lancashire are again busy, would it not be worth while for cotton lords to reflect, whether it is desirable to resume those practices which are the traditional customs of the trade. It is not merely vile morality, but it is a mistaken view of business, which sanctions the admixture of devil's dust with English cotton goods. One of the reasons why certain branches of British manufacture have declined, is the evil reputation earned for them by the consecrated usage of adulteration." (*The World*, Oct. 15, '79, p. 7.) Oh, my brethren, how will all this bear the Light of the Great White Throne! Again, dare we congratulate ourselves on our advancement socially or religiously, when the demons of immorality and drunkenness (and I know not which is the parent of the other) march side by side unblushingly in our midst.

And yet again, my brethren, it is easy for us to hide ourselves under the generalities of a nation's sins, and to forget that nations are made up of individuals; that each one of us must give account of himself to God. Trees of the Lord's own planting are we; nor shall we be far wrong in supposing Him to be the gardener: and ever and again may we hear, if we listen, the voice of the Lord God walking amongst the trees of His garden. Is there no word for us to-night, gathered as we are in this His House of Prayer? Nay, shall we not say that to those who have the form of godliness, this voice has a sound even more distinctly than to others? For, brethren, you will remember that the sin of the Jews was no vulgar form of sensual indulgence: nor was it even hypocrisy as we commonly understand the word. Regular churchgoers as we should say, though they loved, as many an English Christian, the uppermost seats! Exact in the performance of religious duties, no matter where they were nor in what company: for at the corners of the public thoroughfare, if the hour of prayer chanced to sound, would they stand and say their office! Nor was their religion, as is the case with too many of us, one which cost them nothing. If we may take the Pharisee in the parable as a fair specimen, they gave tithes of all they possessed. No! The one fault which spoilt in God's sight this really beautiful exterior was simply that their *heart* was far from Him. And so the voice comes first not to the drunkard nor the fornicator, but to us whose very vocation in life compels us to appear in our conduct outwardly fair unto men; to us who have continually to deal with sacred things, whose lips must daily be uttering sacred words. Oh! my

brethren, let me ask of you, wherever you may be, to pray for those who are set to watch for your souls, that they may not only by their preaching but by their *living* set forth God's Word, and shew it accordingly. That they may *be* what they seem to be.

And for you, God's people. In these days when opportunities without stint are offered: the daily service of prayer and praise; the weekly or even the daily Communion; the church opened for private prayer; guilds and societies whereby we may gain strength in union. For all this we thank God. And those may thank Him, too, who by His grace have been led to yield themselves to these blessed influences, and to make them enter into their daily life. Leaves they are, full of beauty and signs of life. But take care lest they be leaves only! Remember that each opportunity offered and accepted gives a promise of fruit. They ought to be the outward visible signs of inward spiritual grace; and yet you know full well how often, together with, or rather in spite of, all our helps, this is sadly wanting. Possible, an awful possibility, to be a regular and apparently devout communicant with the heart far from God! Here you may see a man of business who will put on religion for the Sunday, not so much to deceive his neighbour as to deceive himself; a kind of make-weight against a multitude of little things which he says the necessity of the trade compel him to do in the course of week-day work, but which he cannot, because he dare not, ask God to bless. There you may see another frequently in the House of God, exact in her performance of religious duties, punctual in her observance of Church services; and yet will never inconvenience herself by a single half hour to allow her servant the like privilege; a very angel of courtesy in society, a very demon of selfishness in the home; exacting, fretful, discontented; utterly and entirely ignoring the fifth commandment; a torment to herself and everybody near her. Strange anomaly! and yet too often true! Leaves, leaves only as yet. Or another there is who attracts you strangely to him: open-hearted and generous in disposition, full of good-natured kindness, winning in manner, with a kind of blunt honesty that would scorn to tell a lie! To know him is to be drawn to him. To be drawn to him is to love him. Leaves, these, full of beauty, and marks of the Great Master's handiwork; but there is a *something* wanting!

Or, once more, the mother who devotes herself, as mothers only can, to her children, working, slaving, contriving for them by day, and often far on into the watches of the night; stinting herself that they may not want; saving all she can that she may spend all she saves in fitting them for a position in the world higher than her own. Oh, brethren, who has not loved to watch love like this? Leaves, again, full of beauty! But if this be all, even here, too, there is a something wanting. They know not; perhaps they care not to know what that something is. And, because they know not, to them the voice of the Lord God, walking amongst the trees of His garden, comes in merciful judgment. The little one is taken and transplanted to a brighter and happier land, where love grows naturally and flowers perfectly. And as the mother's heart goes out after her child, she learns what she had forgotten, or had never realised, that it belongs to another, and had only been lent for a time; and the little brother or sister in Paradise becomes in future the text for herself and her children when she speaks to them of Jesus and His love. And to others, sometimes in some great failure, sometimes leading them face to face with some crushing sorrow, the same voice sounds, bringing home to them the terrible reality of life and death, and teaching them in His love how to live that they may learn how to die.

But there are many here, I venture to say, the burden of whose life is "When I would do good evil is present with me; for I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I find another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin. O, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? My very communions are cold and barren of devotion; my thoughts, when I would that they should rise to God, are ever grovelling on the earth, and as I listen for His voice, I dread lest I should hear it say, 'This one draws nigh unto Me with his mouth, and honours Me with his lips, but his heart is far from Me; in vain does he worship Me.'" Nay! my brother or sister, nay, He looks deeper. The desire of thine heart is to serve Him. This He accepts. It is for this He looks. Do my communions help me to be unselfish at home? Am I able to give way to others more than I did? Can I keep my temper better than I did amongst those who do not feel with me on religious matters? Can I bear ridicule or misrepresentation better? Am I more able to forgive? These are true marks, brethren, bearing the very impress of the King, which the Devil, with all his cunning, cannot imitate. And it is in such little things as these that true fruit is born. Nothing great, for the most part, does Jesus Christ ask of us. He has learnt to live well, who has learnt to do common things uncommonly well; and those with whom you mix take knowledge of you, and though you least suspect it, partake of the fruit. The boy in the play-ground or in the school, or the man in the office or workshop who refuses to laugh at an impure joke; or who being in authority dares to put a stop to the flow of foul language; the servant girl amongst her fellows who ventures to say grace before meals though she knows she will get laughed at for so doing; the man or woman who in the upper ranks of society dares to do or say the right thing in spite of what society may think. All of us in our several stations in life, if, forgetting ourselves and remembering our Master, we do as best we may the duty which lies nearest

to us, must of necessity in the act of doing it glorify our Father which is in Heaven and bear in our life the fruit for which He looks. Nothing great did I say? And yet what can be greater? The greatest man that ever lived did but do his duty! Who is sufficient! Happy for us that He who comes to look beneath the leaves for fruit, is He who wept over Jerusalem, who was tempted in the wilderness, who died on the Cross. He knows our necessities, our ignorances, our difficulties, our poor clumsy tryings after holiness. "We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge. We therefore pray Thee help thy servants which Thou hast redeemed with Thy most precious Blood."

HARVEST THANKSGIVING.

By the Rev. C. B. BRIGSTOCKE, M.A.,
English Chaplain at Homburg, Germany.

Sermon Preached in the English Church, Wiesbaden, on Wednesday Morning, September 29th, 1880.

"The eyes of all wait upon Thee; and Thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest Thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing."—Psalms cxlv. 15-16.

THE Psalm before us is a Psalm of praise. It is the outpouring of a pious heart. It is an act of grateful homage to the Giver of all Good. The Psalmist loved to contemplate the works of Nature, and in them to discover traces of the wisdom and goodness of God. Sometimes he soars to the contemplation of the heavenly bodies, and these excite within him feelings of rapturous admiration. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handywork." (Psalm xix.) Sometimes he dwells upon the dignified position assigned to man in this lower world, and the varied mysterious elements of which his nature is composed. "Lord," he piously exclaims, "what is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that Thou visitest him? For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour." (Psalm viii.) At other times he loves to dwell upon the minute arrangements of God's Providence and the bountiful provision that has been made for the wants of all living creatures. In the text Jehovah is set before us as the Bountiful Giver, and the creatures of His hand are beautifully pourtrayed as immediately and directly dependent upon Him for their daily preservation. "The eyes of all wait upon Thee, O Lord, and Thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest Thine hand and satisfiest the desire of every living thing."

And the earnest Christian loves in this respect to imitate the Psalmist. He cannot look abroad upon the face of Nature with a careless eye or an unmoved heart. By him God is seen in everything, and what others ascribe coldly to the operations of Nature he traces directly to the finger of God. The most insignificant flower is eloquent to him of his Creator's goodness; the meanest insect that crawls beneath his feet speaks to him of God; and as he stands upon some mountain height and surveys the out-stretched landscape, as he gazes upon the gorgeous panorama of wooded forest and sparkling stream, well-cultivated plains and waving cornfields, his heart glows within him with a sense of devout admiration, and he readily responds to the Psalmist's language, "O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! in wisdom hast Thou made them all: the earth is full of Thy riches." (Psalm civ. 24.)

I invite you to consider this day—

I. Our dependence upon God.

II. The duty of acknowledging that dependence.

I. *Our dependence upon God.* How clearly and graphically this is set before us in the text: "The eyes of all wait upon Thee, O Lord, and Thou givest them their meat in due season." The preservation of all living creatures is ascribed unreservedly to God. Now this is a truth which in its most general aspect none amongst us will be found to deny. In our calm moments we all acknowledge that without God's help we are helpless; without His blessing we cannot prosper. But such is the monotony of human life, such the regularity of events, and I must add, such the subtle pride of the human heart, that this truth often becomes obscured and lost sight of. We fail in applying it to the small events of common life. In short, we need some sudden shock, some reversal of our present state to convince us of our own personal nothingness and our entire dependence upon God.

The man endowed with a strong and healthy constitution is scarcely alive to the value of health. Perhaps he has never known a day's serious illness. He is strong and vigorous. His mind is active. His body is fully equal to the demands made upon it. He has a sufficiency of this world's goods. He is not distracted by the cares and responsibilities of high office. He eats and drinks, and in his own quiet way enjoys life. And beyond the occasional feeling of weariness, which just enables him to understand the luxury of sleep, he has no feelings of uneasiness whatever. His days flow on smoothly and noiselessly. He takes his own good health as a matter of course, and thus (as I have said) is not able to realize its value. If he thinks about it at all, he traces it to his own early rising and freedom from anxiety, his moderation in all things, his temperance and active exercise. Thus he congratulates himself on his own superior instincts, and secretly in his own heart he condemns those who are not as fortunate as himself. Meanwhile he forgets that health is a complex thing—the effect of a variety of causes—the result of many laws acting in beautiful and harmonious combination.

But let the smallest portion of his bodily organism be deranged—let some secret fever-germ enter the stream of life and poison the man's blood—let him be cast upon a bed of sickness, so that the slightest effort becomes intolerable, and the commonest functions of the body are attended with

pain, and he at once becomes sensible of his dependence upon a Higher Power. He learns now what he might otherwise never have learned, that his own health is not absolutely in his own hands, but that it is "in God he lives and moves and has his being." Thus he rises from the bed of sickness a wiser and better man; he has more sympathy in his heart for others, and more gratitude towards the Great Giver and Disposer of all things.

And a similar danger attends those that are engaged in the cultivation of the land, the danger, I mean, of forgetting God. The honest farmer who rises with the lark and takes a praiseworthy pride in his earthly calling is, we will assume, on the whole successful. He is kind to his labourers, and these cheerfully perform the tasks assigned to them. The seasons come round and each brings with it its own duties. The land is tilled: the seed sown, and at the appointed time the labours of the husbandman are crowned with an abundant harvest. On the other hand, his neighbour—a farmer like himself—is thoughtless and thriftless. He desires to get on but lacks common judgment and common energy. His plans do not succeed. His cattle die. His land is impoverished for want of proper cultivation. His harvests are poor, and there is a look about the whole place that tells of coming poverty and ruin. And then how great the danger to the *successful* farmer; the danger of tracing success in his case to *his own* energy and enterprize, *his own* skill and industry, and overlooking altogether the Hand of God.

It is true that honest industry is generally in this world, and through God's own appointment, rewarded with success. It is true that God has promised that "while the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest . . . shall not cease" (Gen. viii.); but we are surely abusing that promise, and as surely taking too high a view of our own powers if we fail to realize our dependence upon God, and to acknowledge His goodness in giving us the appointed weeks of the harvest. The farmer may sow goodly seed, but he can not make it germinate. He may till the land with the greatest care, and in its cultivation may apply to it the practical knowledge that he has gained from the study of chemical science, but for all that he can not endow it with productive power. He can not by any influence of his own draw down from Heaven "the early and the latter rain," and yet upon these—upon the fertilizing shower and the genial sunshine—depend, as we all know, to a great extent all his prospects of success. Nay, further, let us suppose that the seed has sprung up, and that the fields are already white unto harvest; let us suppose that the farmer's eyes are gladdened as he walks along and sees the golden grain bending beneath the summer breeze; even then can he *ensure* success? He can not. A few weeks of incessant rain and all his hopes are blighted, all his labours are in vain. But let us have—as, thank God, we have had this year—a few successive weeks of fine weather, and then all anxieties are dispelled, all toil is forgotten in the prospect of an abundant harvest.

We have sought to show you from two instances: the recovery of health, and the development of the seed into a state of maturity, how entire and complete is our dependence upon God. It could not be more so. We can no more preserve our own lives from day to day than we could originally create them. We can no more make the seed to grow by burying it in the earth, than we can compel the sun to shine or avert from our dwellings the electric flash. We are surrounded by forces and powers which we can not control, and which we only slightly understand. Science in modern times has discovered many secrets in the world around us, but she is as ignorant as she ever was of the mystery of life. Ask her what life is and she is dumb. Ask her how to preserve life in some deadly crisis, and she can only hang down her head in hopeless bewilderment. In the preservation of life, as well as in its original bestowment, the honest philosopher no less than the earnest Christian must confess that God's wisdom is "unsearchable," and "His ways past finding out." We notice

II. *The duty of acknowledging our dependence upon God.* To the religious mind no duty can be more plain, none more obvious. If it be wrong on the part of a son to despise or dispute his father's claims upon his regard and affection; if it be contemptible pride on the part of a pensioner to be ashamed to speak of his benefactor or to recognize his obligations, then it is a sin of no ordinary character to forget Him upon Whose daily bounty we live, and to Whom we owe the varied blessings we enjoy. Hence, my brethren, to the Christian mind there is something peculiarly pleasing in our gathering together in the House of God this day. We meet for a special purpose. We meet as a congregation, as a body of Christian men and women moved by one common instinct, to acknowledge our dependence upon God, and to thank Him solemnly and unitedly for having once more given us the fruits of the harvest.

To some the service that we have been engaged in might seem to have special appropriateness in a country parish. In a town like this we have little to do with the sights and scenes of rural life. Still there is no unfitness, but the reverse, in our assembling together at a time like this; for we thus practically recognise the common brotherhood of the human family, and admit that "if one member suffer all the members suffer with it." (1 Cor. xii. 26.) Whatever our occupation may be, we are all (indirectly at any rate) dependent upon the labours of the husbandman. We are all interested in a good harvest. A bad harvest means scarcity of bread, and scarcity of bread means suffering to many hundreds and thousands of our fellow-creatures; and on the other hand it is not easy to exaggerate the tendency of an abundant harvest (such as I believe we have had this year) to spread throughout the country a general spirit of peace and contentment.

Again. Our meeting together on this occasion may be regarded as an *emphatic protest* against the scepticism of the day: a protest against that form of infidelity that is unhappily too prevalent, and that is, I fear, gaining ground amongst us. Men of science are pushing their researches into the varied realms of nature. Phenomena hitherto considered inexplicable are referred to general laws, and second causes are thus usurping the place of the First Great Cause. Thus the Creator is as it were thrust out of His own creation, and it is sometimes argued as though God had originally called this world into being, and then left it to itself—to be guided and controlled by those eternal laws that were at its creation impressed upon it.

Now against this cold and heartless philosophy our meeting together this day is *an emphatic protest.* We thus acknowledge our belief in the universal presence and agency of a Personal God. We believe that it is "in Him we live and move and have our being." We believe that He keeps the pulse beating and the blood circulating within each one of us; that from Him come the refreshing shower and the glowing sunshine, and that to His blessing we owe it that the labours of the husbandman have been crowned once more with an abundant harvest. We see the goodness of God everywhere. We devoutly acknowledge that "His tender mercies are over all His works." Hence we have no difficulty in admitting the almost literal truth of the poetic language of the Psalmist: "The eyes of all wait upon Thee, O Lord, and Thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest Thine hand and satisfieth the desire of every living thing."

One word more. Our service of praise would be obviously incomplete without a religious offering. It was strictly enjoined upon the Jews when assembling together in Jerusalem at their great National Feasts—"They shall not appear before the Lord empty: every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which He hath given thee." (Deut. xvi. 17.) The Jews were constantly reminded that "the poor should never cease out of the land," and the command was "Thou shalt open thine hand *wide* unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in thy land." (Deut. xv. 11.)

You have an opportunity of contributing this day towards the charitable institutions of the town in which you reside. I need not remind you of the advantages you possess here in the way of education and climate; and hence the poor, the friendless, the suffering, have a strong claim upon your sympathy and support. Remember the command is, "Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy needy brother." Give, then, liberally this day of your gold and of your silver. Let us all give as we are able. Thus shall we best attest the sincerity of this day's worship. Thus shall we show the reality of our gratitude to God, and our sense of the varied bnefits that His goodness has bestowed upon us. "Let the people praise Thee, O God; yea, let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth bring forth her increase, and God, even our own God, shall give us His blessing." (Ps. lxvii. 5-6.)

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1880.

LEICESTER CHURCH CONGRESS.

INTERNAL ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

By the DEAN OF LICHFIELD.

Whether it is desirable that increased facilities or powers of legislation shall be granted to Convocation; and, if so, whether the granting of such facilities or powers should be accompanied by any, and what, reforms of Convocation.

This very important question seems to require that we should first consider what are the present facilities and powers of legislation possessed by Convocation; and how far those facilities, and powers appear to have been affected or modified by the changes which have taken place in the constitution of this Realm since the period of the Reformation.

From the earliest times of our Ecclesiastical History of which we have any record, we find in the administration of our Church the combined influence of the authorities in Church and State.

During the period of the Saxon Heptarchy this principle was clearly developed. There are, for example, frequent instances of the Bishop being chosen by the united counsel of the Civil and Ecclesiastical authorities; and when the Saxon kingdoms became consolidated, the same principle was recognised and acted upon. But the Norman conquest was soon followed by the introduction into this country of the separation of the Civil from the Ecclesiastical in judicial and legislative matters. It is true that William I. was careful to assert his own supremacy as Sovereign over both Civil and Ecclesiastical causes. In fact the supremacy maintained by him was precisely the same as that contended for by Henry II. a century afterwards, and finally established by Henry VIII. But during those five centuries from the conquest to the Reformation, our originally independent Church became more and more entangled in the aggressive and encroaching policy of the Papal Court; and thus she gradually forfeited that freedom of self-government which, but for this foreign influence, might have been continued to her. (1) Still, speaking generally, it may be said that from the eleventh century to the sixteenth century the Church of England was chiefly administered by Canon Law. The Statutes affecting the Church of England which were passed during that period were

(1) See Report of Committee of Convocation on "Relations of Church and State," 1879.

chiefly such as had reference to her temporal position. Her protection from the aggressions of a foreign power, and the preservation of her liberties,—these were the more prominent objects for which Statute Law was invoked. The great principle—"Quod Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit, et habeat omnia jura sua integra, et libertates suas illesas," (2)—this is affirmed over and over again. But the general administration of the affairs of the Church was by Canon Law. The Bishops governed their Dioceses through their Diocesan Synods, subject of course to the controlling influence of the Provincial Synods, whose decrees and constitutions were published through the Diocesan Synods. But, unhappily, the Provincial Synods came gradually under the Papal influence. Thus their character as the Synods of an ancient and independent Church was altered, and they were frequently transmuted into Legatine Synods, mere instruments of the Papal power. The Bishops, however, exercised much influence in their own Diocesan Synods, and had the liberty of arranging their own Liturgies or "Uses,"—these Uses being framed for the most part upon primitive models, and forming the staple out of which our Book of Common Prayer was chiefly compiled.

The Reformation was the indirect cause of a considerable change in the government of the Church of England. The overthrow of the Papal supremacy transferred much of that usurped power to the Civil authority; and the result has been that since the Reformation the Church of England has chiefly been administered by Statute Law. A glance at the Statute Book will show how large a number of Statutes affecting the Church of England have been passed since the Reformation, as compared with those which were passed before that event. As a matter of fact, the immediate result of the Reformation was to put an arrest upon the ancient administration of the Church through her Synods; and Acts of Parliament of great importance to the welfare of the Church have frequently been passed, with regard to which the clergy in Synod have had no opportunity of expressing their opinion.

But this was by no means a part of the intended policy of the Reformation. The famous Statute known as that of the "Submission of the Clergy," (3) contains a provision for the examining of the Canon Law of the Realm, as it existed at that time, and for the determining of what portion of it should be "kept and obeyed," and what part should be "made frustrate." Yet this provision still remains inoperative upon our Statute Book. An attempt was made to carry it out by Archbishop Cranmer; and a document was actually prepared—a document containing much useful matter, entitled the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum;* but that document was put aside in consequence of the death of Edward VI., and has never become law to this day. Moreover, the unfortunate silencing of Convocation from A.D. 1717 to A.D. 1853 has still further crippled Church action. We may be thankful indeed that the more just and enlightened policy of recent times has caused the revival of the dormant powers of Convocation; and that it is now once more recognised as an integral part of the Constitution of the Realm. But, although the labours of the last thirty years have not been unfruitful, Convocation has hardly even yet emerged from under the cloud. It is still the fashion in some quarters to think scorn of it; and an unworthy jealousy still exists of the influence of our Provincial Synods—a jealousy which, it may be hoped, will pass away in proportion as it is seen that Convocation is a wise and practical body, working within its own proper sphere, and in loyalty to the Constitution of which it is a part. Perhaps some of our legislators will not be so impatient of even the name of Convocation appearing in a Statute when they more fully appreciate the truth and meaning of Hooker's dictum, "The Parliament of England, together with the Convocation annexed thereto, is that whereupon the very essence of all government within this Kingdom doth depend." (4)

To go back, however, to my point, it may be briefly stated thus: that whereas before the Reformation the affairs of the Church were chiefly administered by Canon Law, since that event they have been chiefly administered by Statute Law.

In real truth, as far as Church legislation is concerned, the Reformation caused a rift which has never yet been closed. Our Canon Law has been left for more than three hundred years with a "ravelled sleeve," and it would be a task worthy of the energies of our best statesmen to "knit it up," and so to place these matters upon a more satisfactory footing by means of the proper constitutional authorities, that is, by the combined action of the Convocation, the Queen, and the Parliament.

But there is another factor which must be taken into account in the consideration of this question. According to the opinion of some of our best Canonists, a Canon which has long fallen into disuse becomes invalid. Bishop Stillingfleet, in his "Ecclesiastical Cases," (5) has some weighty words on this point; and he quotes the language of Gerson, the eminent Chancellor of the University of Paris about A.D. 1400, who says that "many Canons of General Councils have lost their force by disuse, and that the observance of them would be useless and impossible." This view is supported by many authorities of great repute in the Western Church; and it may be safely affirmed to be a recognised maxim of Canon Law that discipline is variable though the faith is unchangeable; and that non-observance of a disciplinary Canon mostly abrogates it as binding upon the conscience, though of course it could at any time be revived by lawful authority. In the Decretals of Gregory IX. it is affirmed that no prescription of less than forty years runs against the Church, which is interpreted to mean that custom abrogates Canons. (6)

The doctrine of the infallibility of the Church Catholic may perhaps have had some influence over the making of a Canon; I mean, so as to preclude its amendment. Hence the custom that if a Canon from any cause ceases to be operative, or needs amendment, it is not altered; but a new Canon is enacted to take its place. I mention these things because they may help to show the position in which our Church stands at the present time with regard to Canon Law. An exception must of course be made with regard to any Canons which have been embodied in Statute Law. Any Canon which has been enforced by Statute Law becomes subject to the conditions of Statute Law, and remains of force until the same power which created it either alters or repeals it.

But I must now remind you that the "Act of Submission" already referred to expressly reserves to the Clergy in their Convocations the power, under certain restrictions and limitations, of making Canons. For

(2) 9 Hen. III. c. 1. A.D. 1225.
(3) 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19.

(4) Hooker. Book viii. p. 342.
(5) A.D. 1702. Vol. i. p. 262.
(6) See Report of Committee of Convocation on "Ecclesiastical Law," A.D. 1878.

the convenience of those who may not be familiar with the technical processes of Convocation, I may observe that there are three separate instruments by which the Royal Supremacy over our Provincial Synods is recognized and exercised.

I. There is (1) the *Royal Writ*, empowering the Archbishops to summon their Convocations. The origin of this instrument is to be traced to the time of Edward I. It was not at first regarded favourably by the Clergy; for it had a bearing upon the subject of taxation, and was resented as an interference with the liberties of the Church. By the time however of Edward III. the loyalty of the Clergy had overcome their prejudices, and they submitted. But the Archbishops, while always obeying the Royal Writ, still retained their own original right of summoning their Synods when they pleased. So matters stood until the Reformation, when the "Act of Submission" restrained them from ever summoning their Convocations without the Royal Writ. What amount of power this instrument gives to Convocation when summoned is a point which has been much debated. It must of course be determined by the language of the "Act of Submission." Now the "Act of Submission" distinctly restrains the Clergy in their Convocations from "enacting, promulgating or executing new Canons without the Royal License." But whether the terms of this Statute preclude them from conference or deliberation with a view to submitting measures for the approval of the Sovereign may reasonably be doubted. Archbishop Wake (7) says, "whether the Convocation may not without the King's License deliberate of such things as may be fit to be done by them for the service of the Church I shall not undertake to say." Then a little further on he adds,—"To deliberate of what might usefully be considered by them, and to petition the King thereupon for leave so to do, this, as it is no attempting to make a Canon, so does it not, I conceive, come within the design of that prohibition which this Act has laid upon them." It will be remembered that Archbishop Wake was not a man who was wont unduly to exalt the authority of the Church.

II. But (2) there is another instrument, entitled the "*Royal Letter of Business.*" The instrument specifies certain matters under the "Royal Sign Manual," which may be deemed proper for consideration. An example of such an instrument, issued in the reign of Queen Anne, January 29, 1710, may be found in a useful little volume entitled "Pearce on the Law relating to the Convocations of the Clergy." We have also had examples of such instruments in recent times. At the opening of the two Convocations previous to the present, those of 1872 and 1874, "Royal Letters of Business" were issued by authority of our gracious Queen, directing the Convocations to take into their consideration the "Fourth and final Report of the Royal Commissioners" on the Rubrics of the Prayer Book; and the answers of the Convocations were laid before her Majesty in the course of last year. There is this great advantage in the issuing of such Letters, that they show in a very marked manner the interest felt by the Sovereign in the welfare of the Church, and the desire of the Sovereign to know the mind of the Convocations upon the matters so submitted to them.

III. Well, then (3), there is lastly the *Royal License*, empowering the Convocations to make Canons or Constitutions. Without this instrument the Convocations have no power to legislate at all.

(7) "State of the Church," p. 535.

Then, further, there is this to be remembered, that a Canon has no validity if it be contrary to the Royal Prerogative or to the Common or Statute Law of the Realm. And even then it has been laid down that although a Canon duly enacted is binding upon the Clergy *in foro conscientiæ*, it does not *proprio vigore*, bind the Laity, unless it is embodied in a Statute.

It becomes then, I think, a very grave question, whether, regard being had to all the intricacies and difficulties which beset legislation by Canon, the Church does not need some simpler mode than she at present possesses for legislating with regard to those matters which are confessedly variable, and which require readjusting from time to time. Our Articles remind us that while the faith and doctrine of the Church remain the same, her ceremonial admits of change according to the "diversities of times and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word." (8)

The great majority of those whom I have the honour to address will agree with me that the highest interests of this nation are associated, under the Divine Blessing, with the maintenance of the union of Church and State. And the problem to be solved is how, under the somewhat altered relations of the Church to the State, those changes which may be deemed needful from time to time for the internal regulation of the Church may be best brought about under a condition of things which still requires that the laws concerning the National Church shall "take their essence from the Church, the Queen, and the Parliament."

It has been thought by many that the principles of a Draft Bill, which has been agreed to by both the Convocations, and has been submitted to Her Majesty the Queen, together with their conclusions upon the subject of the Rubrics, are principles which may ultimately command the assent and approval of thoughtful and practical men, whether Clergy or Laity. The principles of the proposed measure are in few words these.

Leaving out of the question matters of Faith and Doctrine, as being in their essence unchangeable, it proposes that the Convocations duly assembled under the Royal Writ should consider of such matters as may require regulating, such as changes in the Rubrics and in the Directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer, Additional Services and Prayers, and the like; and that their final recommendations with regard to these and similar matters should be laid before the Queen in Council, with the signatures of the two Archbishops affixed to them; and that, if approved by Her Majesty in Council, they should then be laid before both Houses of Parliament; and in case neither House of Parliament shall within the period of forty days present an Address to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to withhold her consent from such recommendations, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty to make an Order in Council ratifying them.

Now the only tangible objection that I have heard to this proposal is this, that it gives to the Convocations, that is to the Clergy in their Convocations, the initiative in these matters. Well, granting that it does so, I would ask, who so proper to take the initiative in these things as the great Provincial Synods of the Church? "In matters of God," says Hooker, "to set down a Form of Prayer, a solemn Confession of the Articles of the Christian Faith, and Ceremonies meet for the exercise of religion, it were unnatural not to think the Pastors and Bishops of our souls a great deal more fit than men of secular trades and callings. Howbeit

(8) Article xxxiv.

when all which the wisdom of all sorts can do is done for the devising of Laws in the Church, it is the general consent of all that giveth them the form and vigour of Law." (9)

To this I would add that it is to the last degree improbable that anything would be recommended by the Convocations, or receive the imprimatur of the Archbishops, before it had been well ventilated in the various Diocesan Conferences composed of Clergy and Laity throughout the country.

If however it is still objected that under the proposed measure the initiative is taken by Convocation, what is to be said of the proposed measure in its subsequent stages? When Convocation has recommended, its functions cease. Its recommendations are passed on to the Queen in Council. The proposals can be arrested *in limine*, and if they go any further, Her Majesty's Ministers are the persons who become responsible for laying them before Parliament. And even then, if they pass the Queen's Council Chamber they can be challenged by Parliament. Are not these sufficient safeguards, sufficient securities that nothing crude, nothing rash or ill-advised would be legalized by such means?

The advantages of the proposal are considerable. They provide a more simple and effective process than any which the Church now possesses, by which she may regulate her internal machinery, without troubling Parliament to do more than either to give or withhold its sanction. And considering the vast and ever enlarging area of questions of State which occupy the Parliament of this great Empire, it seems only reasonable that details of this kind should be dealt with by an easier process, the State still retaining its control over them, so as either to allow or refuse them. The proposal is thoroughly constitutional. Its principle is already admitted in other departments of the State.

I must add a few words upon the remaining question, how far the granting of such facilities should be accompanied with any reform of Convocation. I dismiss at once as visionary and impracticable the idea of any introduction of the Laity into Convocation. If we had to formulate the principles of an altogether new Constitution for the Realm of England,—or if our Church was disestablished, and we had to frame a new system of government for the separated Church,—such a question as this might fitly be raised. At present, however, it is out of the range of practical politics, and for the sake of our country I trust it will continue so.

But there is another question of a thoroughly constitutional character, and that is the question of an enlargement of the numbers of the elected representatives of the Parochial Clergy. If Convocation is to assume greater prominence, and to recommend measures for adoption by Parliament, it is of the utmost importance that it should possess in full measure the confidence of the Church, both Clergy and Laity. Now while believing, as I do, that Convocation as at present constituted is an excellent representative body, there are two reasons which have had much avail in leading me to the conclusion that an increase in the number of the elected representatives of the Clergy is desirable. There is (1) the vast increase in the numbers of the Parochial Clergy. This alone constitutes a *primâ acie* argument in favour of an addition to the Proctors. Then there is also (2) a very strong and prevailing sentiment amongst the Clergy in favour of such enlargement. Both these reasons, and especially the latter, demand our respectful consideration. If by such an increase as is proposed, namely, an increase giving an average of about two Proctors for each Archdeaconry; if, I say, by such an increase Convocation should gain a proportionate increase of confidence, and if at the same time some of the present anomalies, such as indirect election, can be swept away, I think we may rejoice in the prospect of such a reform, the constitutional and legitimate mode of effecting which is by Canon, if it shall please her Majesty to grant her Royal License for this purpose.

I trust that this will be granted; and I will conclude with my earnest hope that such a reformed Convocation, well sustained by Synodical action in every Diocese, enjoying the confidence of the Church, and furnished with those increased facilities of legislation which I have indicated, may, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, mightily increase the influence of our Church both at home and abroad, to the glory of God, and the extension of His Kingdom.

(9) Hooker, Eccles. Polity, book viii. p. 344.

INTERNAL UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

By CANON FARRAR, D.D.

It would be affectation to doubt that the phrase, "the three schools of thought" is a synonym for the parties which are popularly called the "High, Low, and Board Church parties." We may regret their existence as "parties," but as "schools of thought," I will at once express my conviction that it is good for the Church that each one of them should exist; that their influence upon the Church and upon each other has been most beneficial; that if they had not existed, the Church would have been less catholic, less vigorous, less adapted to meet the wants of her children than she is; that they have provoked each other to study and to good works; that they have helped to rescue each other from the tyranny of shibboleths, and the falsehood of extremes; that if they will only work together in mutual amity and mutual toleration they will, even in these days, form a threefold cord which will not easily be broken. And I think thus because I see that, in all periods of progress, unbroken uniformity is impossible, and that artificial uniformity—since it can only co-exist with the silence of terror or the sleep of ignorance—is not desirable. Limits, indeed, there are to the possibilities of corporate union—limits, "Quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum." If any one transgress these, we neither judge, nor hate, nor persecute him, for we hold, with the Emperor Maximillian, that "to offer to domineer over the conscience is to assail the citadel of heaven;" but we say that then he cannot remain a member of the visible Church of Christ. But within these limits there is still large room for liberty and for charity. The Apostles themselves, though they all taught the same truths, yet looked at them from different points of view. The separate type of theology of each was the synthesis between his own individuality and the common truth revealed to all. Round each of them—James, Paul, Kephas—gathered their groups of followers. The school of Antioch differed from that of Jerusalem, and the school of Jerusalem from that of Alexandria. Nay! more—then, as now, there were those who wished to import into these differences all the arrogant fierceness, all the bitter intolerance of partisans. But this was the point of difference at which the Apostles and all good men interfered. They laboured for charity; they left to each other their several spheres; they gave to each other the right hand of fellowship; they never spoke of each other without mutual honour and mutual respect. But while they exposed the sin and the peril of partisan-

ship, yet they never attempted to crush individuality. Their terms of fellowship, as you may read them in St. Paul and St. John, were wide as the universality of the Gospel, broad as the commandments of God. They knew that the absolute truth, the truth in all its fulness and many-sidedness, is for God alone. They knew that as the colours of the rainbow are sevenfold though light is one, so there are sevenfold diversities of gifts and operations inspired by the one Spirit of God. And since the terms of fellowship are thus as catholic as the Church of God, it is clear that railing restrictions of fellowship within the narrow limits of a party are un-Evangelic, un-Apostolic, un-Christian. Will you dare to inscribe His name on the ignoble fluttering pennons of a party, or will you all march beneath that name as it shines on the eternal banner of the Church? But when the Church, in the days of her power, strove to substitute a compulsory uniformity for this high spiritual unity, then began the darkest pages of our history. Then began false types of goodness and false types of orthodoxy. That was the secret of the Inquisition, of Albigensian crusades, of Smithfield martyrdoms, of religious tyranny and religious persecution in all its most hideous forms. What was the result? Uniformity indeed, but a Laodicean uniformity—the uniformity of ignorance, of stagnation, and of death. It was the uniformity which warred against all progress and all freedom; which—to take but two instances—in the Mediæval Church, again and again, with rack and flame put down the beginnings of the Reformation; which, in the deadest days of the Church of England, showed—if I may quote the language of the late Bishop Wilberforce—"a semi-vitality, or rather an anti-vitality, when she drove from her sympathy that saint of God, John Wesley." It was the uniformity which, by crushing inquiry, ruined the cause of truth, which made men afraid to speak, or afraid to speak above a whisper; or which, if they spoke, made them careful "to steer through the channel of no meaning, between the Scylla and Charybdis of yes and no." There is nothing so revolutionary, because nothing so unnatural. as such mechanical uniformity. It is the attempt to keep men's thoughts fixed, when all things, by the very law of their being, are in eternal progress. I say, then, that the friendly coexistence of three active schools of thought in the Church of England is a proof of her vitality. To trace those three schools back to their ultimate roots, in the very nature of the mind, is of course impossible. Practically we may say that the school which is called Low Church, and which prefers to call itself Evangelical—the party whose glory it is to have the possession, and whose temptation it is to claim the monopoly, of Gospel truths—the party which rightly and nobly upholds the claim of the individual judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, owes its revival to the great outburst of religious life in the days of the Methodists. The party which is called High Church, and which prefers to call itself Anglican or Catholic—the party which rightly and nobly lays a deep stress on the Church and the Sacraments—dates its revival from the great Oxford Movement of which some of the leaders still live in honoured age. The party which is called Broad Church, and which prefers not to be called a party at all, which, in point of fact, is not a party, which has no party interests, no party organisation, no party shibboleths, which would be false to its own most cherished principles if it strove to enlist either for its friends the loud eulogies or for its opponents the envenomed depreciations of party newspapers, dates its revival from the Cambridge Platonists. It has no shadow of enmity towards the High Church party. Like them, it attaches deep value to the historic continuity of the Church; like them, it has no jealousy of symbols; like them, it delights in art and music as consecrated handmaids in the service of religion. It has no shadow of enmity towards the Low Church party. Like them, it claims for every soul immediate access to God through Christ; like them, it accepts reason and conscience as more sacred than any outward authority; like them, it wholly relies on the one offering for sin once offered. Does not the very existence of such differing views among holy men show that if "diversity without unity is discord," on the other hand, "unity without diversity is death"? I hold, then, that these schools have been of inestimable service to the Church. The Low Church party revived the earnestness of spiritual religion; the High Church party rescued forgotten truths, stimulated slumbering energy, renewed the order, the beauty, the reverence of worship. Broad Churchmen, ever ready to work with both, devoted themselves with no little success to the study of exegesis, and did no little to co-ordinate the data of revealed truth with the discoveries of advancing knowledge. This has been their influence upon the Church; and what has been their influence upon each other? It has been to widen, to stimulate, to harmonize; to prevent those truths from being obliterated which each severally maintains; to prevent the tyranny of ignorant narrowness, sacerdotal arrogance, and latitudinarian indifference; to save each other from the common blight of Pharisaism, the Pharisaism of loveless religionism; the Pharisaism of exaggerated observances; the Pharisaism of doctrinal laxity, or intellectual disdain. In conclusion, three parties are inevitable, but partisanship is always wrong. Uniformity is impossible; unity is a sacred duty. Sympathy, tolerance, candour are incumbent on all alike; jealousies and revilings are always and in all men a grievous sin. The Jewish schools were rent assunder between the followers of Shammai and Hillel. At length, says the Talmud, the Bath Kol—the Voice from Heaven—decided their rivalries. "Both," it said—(and oh! how often might the Bath Kol so decide our controversies also)—"both are right; but the Nalaccha"—that is, the right rule—"is with Hillel." "Why is this?" asked the Rabbis. And the answer is, "Because the disciples of Hillel were gentle, courteous, and forbearing; while those of Shammai were fanatical and fierce." What is this but the decision of St. Paul at the moment of his loftiest inspiration?—"And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three, but the greatest of these is charity."

—:o:—

By the BISHOP OF DURHAM.

What is our ideal of a Church? By this question I do not mean, what notion have we formed of the company of glorified Saints, the spotless Bride of Christ, the Church keeping her eternal Sabbath? The inquiry has a more immediate and practical bearing: what is our conception of the Church in her working garb, amidst her week-day occupations? What ideal have we formed for the historical Church, the militant Church?

Here is an answer—

"The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind."

If we have watched such a net drawn to shore or hauled into a fishing-boat we shall have no difficulty in realising the force of the image. Here is a confused

mass of living things—hideous and grotesque forms, motley and changing hues—skate, dogfish, cuttlefish—great ghastly eyes glaring out of the abdomen—long slimy hands and feet protruding from the head—every monstrosity of shape and colour. From the bottom of our hearts we pity poor perjured Clarence in his terrible nightmare, confronted with these ugly sights, as he sunk amidst the gurgling, rushing waters. And yet this is the image of the kingdom of heaven. The authority of the Teacher is unquestioned. The tenour of the lesson is plain. And yet the history of the Church teems with examples of its fatal neglect. Like the companion parable of the tares, the figure speaks distinctly, but speaks in vain. It would seem as if men found a zeal for God and a fervour of religion incompatible with the patient waiting which it inculcates. The bravery, the stedfastness, the self-sacrifice, the devotion, the heroism of the Master's example are fully appreciated; but the moderation and forbearance, the *epieikeia* of Christ, find fewer followers among ardently religious men.

The most obvious illustration is the Donatist schism. No one now has a good word for the Donatists. Sitting in judgment on the past, zealous Churchmen would not for a moment hesitate in the choice between the spirit of St. Augustine and the spirit of Donatism. Is this always quite consistent? Do not the same men who condemn the Donatists use language and laud principles which are the very embodiment of the old Donatist spirit? Let us try to put ourselves in the position of a Donatist. What scorn, what pity, what abhorrence did he not manifest towards the lukewarmness, the indifference to truth, the temporising with worldly exigencies, the dalliance with the civil powers, the giving to the Cæsar of the things that are God's, which distinguished the main body of the Catholic Church? With what fervour of language and what strength of conviction did he not quote the Scriptural precept, "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing"? "What has the Emperor to do with the Church?" cried Donatus. "The principle expressed in these words of Donatus," writes Neander, "that Church and State should be kept wholly distinct from each other, had at that time . . . . become universally recognised among the Donatists." How perfectly admirable is the typical Donatist, if zeal and courage and intensity were everything. Yet Donatism was doomed. It had forgotten the counsels of Divine forbearance—"Let both grow together." The fatal schism within was followed by barbarian invasion from without. This is the almost invariable sequence in the history of Churches. The Vandal follows on the heels of the Donatist; and then what becomes of the African Church. "He that hath ears to hear let him hear."

The ecclesiastical history of Africa in the earliest centuries has furnished one illustration; the ecclesiastical history of Scotland in these latest ages will supply another.

Was it not a magnificent sight—a manifestation of conscientious self-sacrifice and zeal for the purity of the Church on the grandest scale—the exodus of those 400 ministers, leaving homes and endowments, going forth they knew not whither, placing their future altogether in the hands of God? It was magnificent. Who can deny it? But was it war? Did it show that generalship, that patience of imperfect instruments, that tolerance of temporary inconveniences, that foresight of consequences which is not less necessary than zeal and courage in the campaign against the powers of evil? Did it not too much resemble that brilliant cavalry-charge of which the bravery, indeed, was transparent and can never lose its moral effect, but wherein the loss of life was ruinous, and which every one condemns now as a military blunder of the gravest kind? For what is the result? Here you have face to face two Churches, absolutely at one in their doctrinal formularies and their ecclesiastical polity—even to the most minute points—not kept apart now even by the question which was the cause of disruption—yet (so it would appear) hopelessly and irreconcilably estranged from each other:—

> They stand aloof—the scars remaining—
> Like cliffs which have been rent asunder,
> A dreary sea now flows between.

Again I say, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

The drift of these remarks will be obvious. The Donatist schism in Africa, and the disruption in Scotland, arose out of relations which were, or were supposed to be, unsatisfactory between Church and State. It is undeniable that at the present moment there is much uneasiness on this very point among English Churchmen. No doubt there are many anomalies in our position with regard to the State. There is much which requires patient forbearance and delicate handling before the tangle can be unravelled. Many ardent spirits are eager to cut the knot at once instead of trying to untie it. To zealous, chivalrous natures more especially there is a sort of attractiveness in the prospect of the gigantic sacrifice which this course would involve. They do not see, or do not reflect, that though the sacrifice would be great to themselves, it would be greater still to their succesors, and greatest of all to the Church of which they are members. The magnificent unworldliness of the Donatists threatens to be repeated once more with all its fatal consequences. The Donatists hailed with satisfaction the advent of the great enemy of the Church, the Emperor Julian, through whom they hoped to secure their independence. Patient working and patient waiting till God in His own good time should disentangle the meshes and loose the fetters,—this was altogether beyond their range of vision. "Let both grow together" was a precept unheeded and unheard. The tares must be rooted out at all hazards.

(To be continued).

Sacred Music in Dublin.—An association has just been formed, entitled "St. Patrick's Oratorio Society." It is under the patronage of the Dean of St. Patrick's, and Lord Ardilaun is its President. His Lordship's father, the late Sir Benjamin Lee Guinness, was the munificent restorer of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and it is fitting that his deservedly ennobled son should be foremost among those who take lively interest in the movement. This association supplies a want long felt in the Irish capital, by the lovers of sacred music. It is purposed to give, during each season, three performances, in the Cathedral. In November next, Handel's *Messiah* will be performed. In February, 1881, Sir Michael Costa's *Eli*, and in May, Spohr's *God, Thou art great*, with Mendelssohn's grand composition, *Lobgesang*. The funds realised, after defraying expenses, will be devoted to the Deanery Endowment Fund, or to the General Sustentation Fund of the Cathedral. A short choral service will precede each Oratorio.

The Bishop of Lichfield has appointed the Rev. W. Inge, M.A., vicar of Alrewas, to be one of his examining chaplains. Mr. Inge was formerly Fellow of Worcester, Oxford, having taken a first Class in Classics in 1853.

The *Record* states that the Rev. F. F. Goe, rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury, has been chosen to fill the place among the Simeon Trustees vacant by the death of Prebendary Auriol.

On Saturday the congregations of St. John's Chapel, Hampstead, made a special collection for the Church Missionary Society as memorial to the late minister, the Rev. Henry Wright. It amounted to upwards of £500.

The Rev. E. Jeffreys, vicar of Ceres, South Africa, who is on a short stay in England, has announced at Portsmouth that it is intended to erect a church at Isandula to commemorate the loss of so many brave men.

The Rev. Alexander Robinson, chaplain of Moradabad, who lost his life by the second landslip at Naini Tal, was on short leave of absence from his own station. Not sheltering in the Assembly-rooms, with zeal and energy he joined the "working party" and perished, leaving six young and motherless children.

The vicarage of St. Peter's, London Docks, lately vacated by the death of the Rev. C. F. Lowder, has been accepted by the Rev. R. A. J. Suckling, of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, rector of Barsham, Beccles. Mr. Suckling was ordained by the Bishop of Salisbury deacon in 1865, and priest in 1867. In the following year he was presented to the family living of Barsham, with a net income of £490, and a population of 217.

At the dinner which was given at Maidstone after the conclusion of the Archbishop of Canterbury's recent Visitation, a portrait for the Library at Canterbury, with an address signed by five hundred of the clergy and churchwardens of the diocese, was presented to Archdeacon Harrison. In asking his Grace to make the presentation the Rev. H. Harrison, vicar of Kilndown, said he was afraid that in 1841 or 1842 he gave a good deal of trouble to Archbishop Howley, and his dear churchwarden and patron (Mr. Beresford Hope), whose absence that day he deeply regretted. It was proposed to have what was now a very common thing—a procession with clergy in surplices; but the Archdeacon, in his caution, thought he could not attend—it was something so new. So Mr. Hope and himself went in a carriage and four to Canterbury, and found the Archdeacon in his study full of books. He said, "The surplice is the property of the parish. Therefore you have no right to go and take it away and use it elsewhere than for your parish church." That was only one of the many anecdotes which he might tell to show how the Archdeacon had developed. The Archbishop, in accepting the task, said he had known the Archdeacon in a great many capacities, but it was not until now that he knew he was an advocate for development. There was no one who had known the Archdeacon for a longer time, for even those who remembered him when he first came into the diocese did not remember him as he did when he had just taken his Bachelor's degree, and when, in passing him, everybody said "That is Benjamin Harrison. He is a rising man, and very clever fellow." The Archdeacon had certainly played an important part in the Church of England. Forty years was a very long time. Many whose names were then household words in the political world and in the ecclesiastical world were dead and gone, but here was the Archdeacon still, vigorous as ever and ready as ever to help every one in the work he had to do. The Archdeacon was one of the revisers of the Old Testament translation; and there was no man in the whole commission whose opinion on points of Hebrew scholarship had more weight.

The Rev. G. Venables, vicar of Great Yarmouth, has been offered, and has, it is stated, declined, the rectory of Whitechapel, which the Rev. J. F. Kitto is about to vacate for another living.—*Daily Chronicle.*

The Medical Guild of St. Luke will keep its festival in St. Paul's Cathedral on Monday evening, October 18th. Canon Carter is announced as the preacher in an advertisement to be found elsewhere.

The vicar of St. George's, Bristol, having refused to officiate at the funeral of an unbaptised child, offered the parents the alternative service under the act; but on Saturday afternoon the child was buried by Mr. Lance, a Congregationalist minister.

On Thursday Archdeacon Prest delivered his annual Charge to the clergy of the achdeaconry and officiality of Durham. Referring to the Burials Bill he said the provisions to the majority of the clergy had been unwelcome, but by the wise and loyal they would be frankly accepted and obeyed.

The Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's have appointed the Rev. Piers Leopold Claughton, second son of the Bishop of St. Albans, to the rectory of Hutton, Essex, vacant by the resignation of the Rev. Henry Holme Westmore. Mr. Claughton graduated at Oriel College, Oxford, in 1873, and he was ordained deacon in 1875.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Birtwell, Rev. G., vicar of St. Elizabeth, Ashby, near Bowden.
Browne, Rev. C. W. H., Missions to Seamen Chaplain, Penarth Roadstead.
Bubb, Rev. O borne, rector of Woodeaton, Oxon.
Carver, Rev. Henry Jonathan, rector of Melbury Abbas, Dorset.
Davis, Rev. J. Hart, vicar of St. Mary's, Huntingdon; vicar of St. James's, Bristol.
Fairclough, Rev. William Hutchinson, vicar of Christ Church, Lichfield; vicar of Barton-under-Needwood.
Forster, Rev. Charles Augustus, rector of Walton-in-Gordano and Weston-in-Gordano.
Garry, Rev. W. W., Missions to Seaman Chaplain, Newport Docks, Monmouthshire.
Gerratt, Rev. W. J., vicar of Gannow, Barnsley.
Hadow, Rev. G. R., senior curate of Wilton; rector of Calston, Wilts.
Hodges, Rev. J. H., vicar of East Leach, Gloucestershire.
Ibs, Venerable John Hodson, archdeacon of Stafford, vicar of Barton-under-Needwood; vicar of Christ Church, Lichfield.
Parsons, Hon. and Rev. Randal, rector of Sandhurst, Berks.
Phillips, Rev. J. R., Missions to Seamen Chaplain, Cardiff Docks.
Rooker, Rev. John, director of the Church Missionary Children's Home at Highbury; vicar of St. Peter's, Clifton-road, Bristol.
Suckling, Rev. R. J., rector of Barsham, Suffolk; vicar of St. Peter's, London Docks.
Theed, Rev. T. M., vicar of St. Michael's, Buslingthorpe, Leeds; vicar of Ferriby, near Hull.
Vernon, Rev. W. G., vicar of St. Philip's, Pennfields, Wolverhampton.
Westmacott, Rev. Walter, perpetual curate of Highbridge.
Wilcox, Rev. Henry Jenkyns, vicar of Nettleden, Bucks.

: o :

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Clark, Rev. Henry, Bart., at the Rectory, Northfield, of Rossmore, county Cork, forty-six years rector of Northfield and Cofton Hackett, on the 2nd inst., aged 75.
Oliver, Rev. Henry Alfred Green, M.A, of inflammation of the heart, Jesus College, Cambridge, head-master of St. John's-wood School, on the 11th inst., aged 36.
Platten, Rev. Thomas Parlett, M.A., J.P., at Chellesworth, Suffolk, suddenly, for twenty-eight years rector of Chellesworth, on the 4th inst., aged 68.
Symmonds, Rev. Horatio Giles, rector of Winthorpe, Newark, on the 29th ult.
Young, Rev. Robert, M.A., at Wells, head-master of the Cathedral Grammar School, Wells, and late vicar of Calton, Staffordshire, on the 9th inst., aged 38.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

By the Rev. T. H. STOKOE, D.D., Head Master of King's College School, London.

Sermon Preached in the Chapel Royal, Savoy, on Sunday, October 10th, 1880.

"And as He prayed, the fashion of His countenance was altered, and His raiment was white and glistering. And, behold, there talked with Him two men, which were Moses and Elias: who appeared in glory, and spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem."—St. Luke ix. 29—31.

THERE are certain scenes in our Lord's life which seem at first to stand out in conspicuous relief from the narrative, as if they were complete in themselves. And yet a little reflection is sufficient to show that, so far from having no immediate relation to their context, these events are the natural sequence of that which precedes, and the natural introduction to that which follows, and so are integral parts of the whole Gospel, without which the rest would be but partially intelligible. Thus it has been well said that the narrative of the Temptation, which seems so self-contained, ought never to be considered apart from that of the previous Baptism, in which the Son of God received the armour which He immediately went forth to prove in the encounter with His spiritual adversary; and the relation of this struggle to the commencement of the personal ministry is equally clear, as the preparatory discipline of seclusion and trial. And in like manner the scene recorded in the second lesson for this evening's service, and commonly known as the Transfiguration, which seems to break the continuity of the narrative, is really the crisis of the ministry—the climax up to which the whole previous train of thought and action has been leading; the starting-point of a new period in the history of the Saviour's work; the first clear intimation of the coming end of suffering and of glory.

The Galilean ministry was drawing to a close. The Master and His disciples, as St. Matthew tells us, (whose account of this period I shall follow, as the fullest and clearest) had passed beyond the limits of His previous circuits, to the borders of Cæsarea Philippi, and there Jesus put to His followers the question designed to lead up to a confession of His true nature, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" The popular misconceptions, which variously identified Him with John the Baptist, or Elias, or Jeremias, or one of the Prophets, were not shared by those to whom it was given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God. To the appeal, "But whom say *ye* that I am?" Peter, the impulsive spokesman of the chosen Twelve, gave that reply, which was the result of no human intuition, but of Divine revelation: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." The promise of an indestructible Church which followed led on to the intimation of that Passion, by which alone this perpetual power of resistance to evil could be purchased. The refusal to accept this condition of suffering, the presumptuous attempt to dissuade from this baptism of affliction, brought down upon the Apostle, but now so highly eulogised, the sternest words of rebuke ever uttered by Christ; the same with which the Tempter in the wilderness was dismissed, "Get thee behind Me, Satan." And then the doctrine of the Cross was proclaimed; the spirit of self-sacrifice, which alone can avert the inestimable loss of the soul; and the prophecy of final compensation ended with the words: "Verily, I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom."

And then, after six days (or, as St. Luke, reckoning inclusively, says, "about an eight days after"), as to the events of which interval the historians are silent, there comes that vision of glory, which cannot itself be the fulfilment of this prophecy, but apparently anticipates that consummation. Whether on the traditional Mount Tabor, or more probably on Mount Hermon, or elsewhere, is of little moment. By night, it would seem, the Saviour ascended to the summit of some mountain, with three only of His chosen followers—Peter, and James, and John—the same three selected for this vision of glory, who alone should afterwards witness the supreme agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. What lasting impression the scene produced on the second of these favoured disciples we know not. We may well believe that when the hour came in which he, as the first Apostolic Martyr, was to witness for his Lord, the recollection of that night would be to him, when the sword of the executioner was unsheathed for the blow, as the vision which dying Stephen saw, of "the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." When St. John commenced the Gospel of the Incarnate Word, as he reviewed the cherished memories of the ministry, this reminiscence above all others may have prompted the parenthetical words, "And we beheld His glory: the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father." In the brief writings of St. Peter which are preserved to us, one portion is full of ideas which appear to be suggested by this scene, in which he was an eye-witness of His Lord's majesty in the holy mount, and heard, as he tells us, the voice from the excellent glory, "This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased.

And there, on that lonely mountain height, their Master, as He prayed, was transformed. The three disciples woke up suddenly from sleep, (for this seems the simple, natural meaning of the words, and not that they were throughout in an ecstatic condition of wakefulness), to find the darkness of

the night illumined with heavenly radiance, and the summit bathed in a flood of glory. The Evangelists seem to exhaust their powers of description in trying to convey some impression of the transcendant brightness, which radiated from the person of their Lord. And He was no longer alone. Beside Him were two forms whom they recongnised as the greatest Teachers of the old dispensation; the representatives of the law and the prophets—Moses and Elias. Nor was this a silent vision, but voices were heard breaking the stillness of the night with words which must have thrilled those amazed listeners, discussing the end which was drawing so quickly on, "telling of His decease," of His exodus or departure, when the work should be finished which His Father had given Him. And as the vision began to fade, as the two mysterious visitants departed enraptured; impulsive Peter broke forth into speech, eager to prolong that glorious sight, eager still to postpone that dreaded end, of which he had now heard more than when his tempting suggestion to evade the destined suffering had drawn down words of rebuke—reluctant to quit that serene height for the stern realities of life and death, "Master, it is good for us to be here." But even while he spoke, the answer came to the wild proposal of the enthusiast; for, as the vision melted away in a cloud of overshadowing brightness, a voice was heard which told how, as Moses and Elias had passed from their sight, so the day of the law and the prophets was over; how there was to be henceforth one Prophet, one Master, one Lord; how the one duty, the one hope, the one aim of each true disciple should be to hearken unto the voice of His Words, to follow the blessed steps of His life, to follow even along the thorny road of toil and suffering, to be obedient to the end, faithful unto death; "This is My beloved Son, hear Him."

"And when the voice was past, Jesus was found alone." Before the awful sound of those words, St. Matthew tells us, the disciples had fallen on their faces, and were sore afraid, till the gentle touch and the cheering words of their Master reassured them. The vision which was to confirm their faith in the Christ, the Son of the living God, was over. The words which foretold the end, to which they had listened awe-stricken, were for themselves alone; to be divulged to no other, till the Resurrection had further attested the Divinity of their Master; that rising from the dead, which they could not as yet comprehend. The appearance of the predicted forerunner of Messiah prompted *one* question; but beyond this they seem to have refrained from curious enquiry into this mysterious vision. And so they came down from the Mount, to encounter a scene, which might well make them wish that Peter's idea of a sojourn on that serene height had been realised; to find the old weary struggle between good and evil raging, to find the powers of evil triumphant, and their fellow disciples baffled; to hear the agonized cry of a father, and to witness the terrible struggles of his demoniac son.

The Transfiguration of our Lord was the crisis of His earthly life. Three times was the voice from heaven heard, and on each occasion it marked the commencement of a new stage—when His Baptism inaugurated the ministry, when this vision on the Mount attested His Messiahship, and when the Passion which was to terminate His work was close at hand. This scene of glory was the turning point into that last reach of the straight and narrow road, at the end of which loomed the hill of Calvary, and on which the shadow of the cross was already falling. There, in that vision was revealed the system of God's education of the world; how the crisis of the Divine economy had come, when God who in time past had spoken by the prophets, should speak not alone by the life and teaching, but by the sacrifice and death of His Son; and the past, and the present, and the future were merged on that Mount of Glory, where the representatives of the law and the prophets appeared side by side with the Mediator of the New Covenant; and even while their forms were illumined with heavenly brightness, they discoursed of that last humiliation which should precede the final entrance into glory.

And, brethren in Christ, what are the truths which this scene of brightness, yet of sadness, is designed to teach *us?* What message of comfort and guidance comes to us from that mountain-height of glory? Believing that every feature of our Lord's earthly life is in some sense reproduced in the lives of His servants—that in all things He was made like unto His brethren; that from first to last He is our example; and that we are to follow Him, at however humble a distance, alike in His sufferings and in His exaltation; I venture to suggest, some parallel to our own experiences, even in that calm heavenly vision, which seems so far removed from the gloom and turmoil of our struggling, sinful lives.

And, first, it is, I think, worthy of remark, that the word which is here used by St. Matthew and St. Mark to describe our Lord's Transfiguration, in the only two passages in which it is employed elsewhere by the writers of the New Testament, is applied with a natural difference of tense to that gradual transformation into the likeness of Christ, which accompanies the progress of spiritual life. "Be ye not conformed to this world," says St. Paul, "to the converts at Rome, but be ye *transformed* by the renewing of your mind." "We all," he tells the Corinthian Church; (I quote the words as they stand in the English version, without touching on the difficulties of the passage, or of the argument in which it occurs,) "We all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed (*are transformed*) into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." The same word which describes the sudden transitory glorification which the enraptured disciples beheld on the Mount, is appropriate also to the gradual change from the earthly to the heavenly; that change, restricted in this life to the continued

renewal of the inner man; but which shall be consummated when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, and shall then change even the *body* of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory.

But especially I would ask you to notice that which St. Luke alone is careful to record—the connection of the Transfiguration with prayer. Christ had gone up into the mountain to pray—there on that calm and peaceful height, He was holding converse with the Father. What the subject of this communion was we are not told, but we may infer that it related to the coming struggle. And as, when again on the threshold of His Passion He prayed in agony, there appeared an angel from heaven strengthening Him, so now this vision of glory was the answer to His prayer. May not we, too, know—have we not *known* something of this blessedness of communion with God? In those times of strong, earnest prayer, which, alas, come at such rare intervals to enliven the deadness, the formality of our so-called devotions; or when partaking of the blessed sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, have we not felt a sense of calm and peace, such as the world cannot give—a foretaste of heavenly brightness and heavenly joy—a consciousness of new strength to crush the hateful yet darling sin—to perform the invidious duty, to face the coming trial, to bear the bitter pain, the crushing sorrow—to take up the Cross resignedly and follow our Lord, knowing that we must suffer with Him if we would be *glorified* together.

And does not the story of the Transfiguration teach us again the value of that which is akin to, but not the same as prayer; that nutriment of spiritual life, which is so apt to be neglected in this busy, struggling, restless age in which we live—meditation—the silent communing of the heart with itself and with God. To many it seems almost impossible, amid the constant distractions of professional and domestic and social life, to assign to such tranquil contemplation any portion of the preoccupied day. Yet can we not find, if we will, *some* resting places wherein we may thus recruit for our labourious journey? Those few minutes only, it may be, of undisturbed leisure by day; those silent hours of wakefulness by night, during which our thoughts so constantly gravitate earthwards, to selfish cares and frivolities and passions—that day of rest from secular engagements, which summons us to rise with our risen Lord from the grave of carnal lusts and worldly anxieties, and seek those things which are above; might we not devote *some* of these to reflection on the solemn realities of life, and death, and eternity? Is it not, to a great extent, this communing with self, and communing with the unseen world, which makes times of sickness, times of bereavement, when perforce the wheels of our busy life are stopped awhile, and our thoughts are *driven* inwards and upwards, which makes these such blessed, though sorrowful, seasons of renewal? And, above all, such meditation is essential at any fresh start in our lives—in the prospect of any great change of condition or of work—even as our Lord, in the crises of *His* earthly life, retired to the wilderness, to the mount of glory, to the garden of agony.

But still more forcibly does this story teach us that, though such times of meditation are needful for our spiritual refreshment, the true life of the Christian is not one of passive contemplation, but of active work for God. The proposal of enraptured Peter to build tabernacles, and perpetuate the vision of glory, was answered by its disappearance; and was quickly followed by the descent from that holy, tranquil Mount, to the renewed battle with sin and suffering, amid the excited crowd below. And so, whenever *we* seek to evade the stern realities of daily toil and trial, and to exchange the weariness and vexation of spirit which the stedfast performance of duty involves for the more congenial atmosphere of calm seclusion; whenever the thought, "It is good for us to be here," is prompted by mere selfishness, and is the poor subterfuge of making a so-called life of religious retirement the alternative for hearty work for our Master; there is a stern voice which summons us from our self-complacency, pointing to the seething mass of humanity around us, and crying: "Is *this* to follow the steps of Him who went about doing good, whose very meat was to do the will of Him who sent Him, and to finish His work." If ever such enraptured contemplation were venial, surely it might have been on the Mount of Ascension; yet, even there, as the eleven stood with upturned faces, straining their eyes whither their Lord had vanished in a cloud of glory, angelic voices bade them remember the work which He had given them; "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into Heaven; this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into Heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen Him go into Heaven."

Yes—for above all other lessons, the story of the Transfiguration teaches us that the only way to enter into glory is the way of the Cross. Even in that vision of transcendent brightness, "they spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem." It was but a brief respite in the ministry of humiliation and toil, which should end on Calvary. Even so, God in His goodness has provided for us seasons and means of recreation in our weary pilgrimage; foretastes and earnests of future happiness and glory; prayer, meditation, the ministry of the word and sacraments, the voice of the indwelling Spirit, the sense of a "peace that passeth all understanding." But the disciple is not above his Master; he too, through toil and suffering must enter into glory; the vision of brightness and rest can be but as a passing glimpse of heaven, till in God's appointed time, "they who have come out of great tribulation, shall serve Him day and night in His temple, and He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell (shall *tabernacle*) among them."

THE GREAT AUTHORITY.

By the Rev. WILLIAM B. PHILPOT, M.A.,
Vicar of South Bersted, Bognor, Sussex.

Sermon Preached at the Chapel of Ease, Boston, Lincolnshire, before the Boston Grammar School, Sept. 12th, 1880.

"He taught them as one having authority."—Matt. vii. 29.

THERE resides in what is called an "authority" a power which we shall do well to contemplate. When I speak of an "authority" I mean that position as an adviser which is gained only by diligent, study, and habitual practical research; or else by the inherent endowment, always a valuable if not an essential adjunct, of special gifts or a superior nature; or, in fine, as in the unique case of our sweet Master—the First of all that we know—by the full possession of that Nature which is Supreme.

Take the Medicine-Man. He has studied the laws of health, and he has watched and mastered the workings of disease. He knows the conditions of life, and he can tell you, as none others can, the causes of death. You or I, with our mere common sense (if we are so fortunate and exceptional as to possess even that in any degree), untrained and uncultivated as we are in those regions of observation, live we know not how, and fall ill and die, we mostly know not why. And if in any intricate or unusual case we hazard a conjecture, it is such as to cause a melancholy smile to play round the lips of the only men who know. The medical man to us is the only person whom we can regard as entitled speak in medical matters with authority.

Take again the *legal* man. From his youth up he has been among the contemplation and the practice of that deep pursuit which treats of the regulation of the agreements and differences (so far as they can be distinguished, for these mostly spring from those) between man and man, and about the adjustment of rights. It is idle for you and me to pronounce upon how a knotty, much less a clear, case is likely to be settled. But the legal authority can pierce by a kind of magic through the hazes and pretexts, the falsehoods and subterfuges of litigants, spot by an intuitive decision the merits of the case which you bring before him, and specify to you the vantage-ground possessed by the man who may be in the wrong. It may seem to us, indeed, in our rough estimate, that the thing is as plain as the day-light; but the masterly acquaintance of your legal man with the precedents and technicalities of Courts will give us in a few words advice which may save our ignorant innocence from plunging into certain disaster; so as to make us rather "bear the ills we have, than fly to others which we know not of." Thus you see in *legal matters* the only person entitled to speak with authority is your *legal man*.

And so in philology, and indeed in all specialities, providing always that one-eyed men in their several realms of study be not permitted, to their neighbours' detriment, to reign wholly unquestioned.

I will not, for obvious reasons, take that profession of the divine, to which I have the high honour to belong; but the honest man of puzzled conscience *should*, here and there, find some of us an authority on matters which perplex him; and indeed, this brings me to eternal topics, and therefore touches closely on what I now have to say. For let us leave the contemplation of professional examples, and go into the region of the highest life. There are those, we know, who lead such a life. We have among us, happily, and have had from the beginning, men who are genuine students of the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. All the day long, all the long day of their life, is their study in it. They are not like those fish that come only now and then to the surface to breathe that upper air; but these blessed regions of contemplative insight are to them their native element.

There are, and always have been, vain persons, notably, scientific men, who live mainly among laboratories and dissecting-tables and ephemeral natures, who parade their one-sidedness and boast of their blindness by even venturing to cast discredit and ridicule on the very existence of a God; of Whom they know nothing, nor care to know, and yet they see around them the most high-minded and trustworthy of their fellow-citizens, living and moving and delighting to have their being in that very God whom they deride. Standing on their lower level, with which they assume to be contented, (though that nervous anxiety to displace God from the faith of others, does not, I own, indicate any very serene satisfaction in having displaced Him from their own), they mock at the invitation of Him who says, "Friend, come up higher," and set down as the victims of self-deception those who accept the welcome of Heaven. But, take note, I pray you, what a small-minded thing this is, and what a cramped imagination it betrays in these men, to do what they dare not do, and would not dream of doing, in medicine, in law, or in any other line of profession, and to reject the authority of students in matters which they themselves have never seriously studied. For merely to study *objections* to a region of thought in which they do not live, and to which they do not practically devote themselves, or even use themselves at all, is not a study in that sense of the word which invests men with *authority*. How could it be so? Who would regard as an authority upon law that writer who bends his main endeavour to show that law is futile? Would you go for a cure to that empiric who had spent his life in proclaiming that physicians were unable to battle with disease? Or, should we, in fine, ask, "what must I do to be saved?" of anyone who takes no delight in, and makes no study of, the way of salvation?

No: it is proverbially hard to prove even a bare un-opposed negative. But when a positive and proved affirmative is opposed to it, then naturally the negation, by the weight of its own folly, falls heavily

to the ground. Now the sustained intuitions, the deliberate convictions of time-long successions of the sane—intuitions and convictions which grow with the growth of the best civilisation—these, I say, have in themselves the force of positive affirmation, and would stand on their own base, being, in fact, the form taken by Revelation, even if they had no more distinct Revelation to stand upon. This is the unreasoned Reason of Faith. You may set it down as certain, that all the negations made by the specially ignorant, must fail to weigh down one intuitive perception, one clear assertion, of the man who from habitual converse with God tells us that he knows his Father. You might as well tell Livingstone there is no Africa, or dispute with Stanley, the traveller, the fact of a Livingstone. If ten thousand people tell me they do not believe that the Queen exists, because they have not seen her, how can that be set against my statement that, having seen her most religious and gracious Majesty, I know that she exists? The thing is preposterous, and such negations set against such affirmations, so far from being "humanitarian" and "positive" are, in fact, positively inhuman, and absolutely null.

To recur for a moment to an instance of the man of business. I was talking the other day with a bank-manager, of large and long experience. Without going into other people's affairs (which neither I would have done, or he would have allowed!), that gentleman made it in a short time very manifest to me that his was a post demanding such special knowledge, such practised acumen, observation at once so wide and so minute, such insight into the subtle turns and delicate twists of social requirement, that I went away convinced more firmly than ever that none but a bank-manager could manage a bank. I saw something of what it meant to be an *authority*. In fact, who but a station-master can manage a station? Who but a signal-man in his signal-box, or those who instructed him, is an adept and an authority upon the signals?

Of course all this stands to reason, and is too obvious to dwell upon. But why is it to be different in the Religion of life? How plain it is that in spiritual matters the student of spiritual truth is the only trustworthy authority. The carnal mind knoweth not the things of the Spirit of God; they are foolishness unto him, because they are spiritually discerned.

A clown goes into a lecture-hall, and hears the lecturer discoursing on Hydrostatics, on the Theory of the undulation of Light, or on any other mathematical or scientific topic, be it abstruse or be it simple: he cannot for the life of him persuade himself that the man in cap or gown is not a born fool. He stands at the door with his mouth wide open, and a grin of incredible incredulity and comic contempt marks every feature of the face of that honest rustic. He could tell the Professor many things about the sheep and the pigs, but for the matter in hand his ignorance is patent, simply because his faculty is latent. And this is in fact the very attitude in which the infidel and blasphemer stands, however much he may know about protoplasm and other animal matter, when he hears the high-souled student of the Holy Book, or any genuine believer, expatiating with divine fervour on the things of the Spirit of God, taking the things of Christ and with constraining power labouring in vain to show them to his unwoke capacity.

Alas! I for my poor part know but little, compared with all which I know that by this time I *should* know, of these blessed topics I tell of; but I *do* know thus much, and thus much I tell you, yes, tell you professionally if you will, I know that when I read the words of Jesus and His Apostles, I find in them that subtle spirit of knowledge, that intimate acquaintance with the relations of God to man, that refined aroma of experience upon the instinctive science of human life, upon that science of sciences which indeed concerns us all, but in which only its practical students can claim any weight, which forces me thankfully to declare that *they* know what they are speaking about and what they testify These, above all others, nay these alone, let me inform you, or remind you, speak with authority, and with that authority which none by any other study can attain to; with that very authority which our inmost needs demand and to which it were best for you and me with our inmost souls in all humility to bow.

It does not argue wisdom to desire over-much to know more than it has pleased our Father in this stage of our existence to tell us. Admitting the legitimate range of human enquiry, and applauding as highly natural the thirst for all that men may hope fairly and usefully to know, yet, to be ever perplexing ourselves in the endeavour to adjust the universe, desirous, if we could, even to re-issue its conditions, and contract to make it work on simpler principles and easier terms, this is not a mark of a sound mind, nay, it is rather the sign of a mind which is deeply unsound, for this way lies the worst form of madness.

Is this not so? Look with me for a moment how madness works. A mind may run off the rails of reason either in the way of delusion, fatuity, incoherence, or passion, which is while it lasts a brief madness, and if it be habitual, is habitual madness. That is to say, a poor spoiled brain may make a man think that to be which is not, or that not to be which is, seeing or fancying that he sees more devils than vast hell can hold. That is delusion.

Or again, he may sit with leaden eye that loves the ground, drivelling and making moves, and muttering sounds which are un-meaning. That is fatuity.

Or again, he may ramble on in his mother-tongue, like a babe that strums on some goodly instrument with ideas that follow each other in no sort of order, either mildly inconsecutive, or aimlessly ferocious. That is incoherency.

Or else, in fine, he may be seen and heard by his paralysed and useless friends, indulging in angry extravagance, and inveighing with absurd perturbation, and misplaced or excessive indignation, about things which cannot be helped. That is the very ecstasy of passion.

All these are but the common forms of insanity, and are profoundly to be pitied, and carefully to be guarded against by all in their earliest indications. But, mark me, no way lies more direct into the mental dissolution and decay of intelligent perception, than that which can lead a man as we see, simultaneously into the passion, the incoherency, the fatuity, and the delusion, of first denying his God, and then fighting angrily against the God whom he denies!

Look what takes place in the moral nature of such an one. Instead of allowing his godlike faculty of faith which is only reason in its highest form of self-affirmation to grow up sweetly towards Heaven, he cuts it summarily down, and keeps no longer any spiritual leafage through which to nourish his best nature with congenial air. All of that has withered. He bends himself back on his own poor, finite, and now truncated self. Having transplanted himself from the rivers of wholesome water where his God had planted him, he isolates himself in a little earthen pot—a little potter's vessel soon to be broken in pieces—where the roots of his nature become cramped and matted, and at last putrify, while his blossom goes up in dust. He brings forth none of that best fruit which to the straight-growing, upward-shooting soul is seen to come in its season; or, to change the image and use the words of David, "he is like chaff which the wind driveth away."

With those quiet and interesting questions, those sweet and holy mysteries, which are so deeply fascinating and so wholesomely delightful to every genial and thoughtful soul, he deals in a temper the very last which should be brought to them, and in a mood the most fatal of all to the sanity, as well as to the success, of the thinker. The man of sane and holy meditation hopes to know, by following on to know, the Lord. This is to him the harvest of the quiet eye. Upon *him* new lights keep ever breaking at every turn of the road along which his Father leads him. Instead of hating the happy light from which he falls, he loves the happy light to which he rises; and when he comes to an acknowledged difficulty, to the bottom of a sack, to a point where it is for any one, or at least for him, obviously impossible to proceed, he humbly bethinks him who he is, and what he is. He remembers the infinity of his subject-matter, and the years of the right hand of the Most High, from Whom both he and all proceed. Thus he reposes before such a puzzle as a wise man should do, and quiets himself with common-sense reflection that in the presence of a manifest impossibility the mind may rest as calmly as before an ascertained and open truth.

But far otherwise is it with the man who puts God out of his knowledge. He cuts himself off, as we have seen, from the fountain of living waters. He fights, and beats his weak wings against the bars of the cage that he makes for himself, and in which, like that cruel Cardinal of the Eleventh Louis, he is doomed to durance vile; or, like some mad runaway horse, he dashes himself against all the impassable walls which impede his wild career. He lifts his head on high, and snorting in terrible blasphemy, he lets his tongue run dangerously loose among the simple and ignorant folk that throng the thoroughfares of society. Turning the freedom of the Press, granted him by his country and his time, into unwarrantable license, of which he is sometimes sternly reminded by the Courts, he leaves nothing unsaid. Availing himself of that questionable freedom, which has let him fling up his heels unhaltered in the commonwealth, he flies at great and hallowed institutions, and, by sheer force of arrogance, plunges through them as if they were a paper barrier. Have we not lately seen such an one paralysing the very Legislature, and saying of the Deity, as Cromwell said of the Mace, "Take away this bauble?" And at such a bidding they have in fact taken God away, so that, alas for England, no man now who goes up to make our laws need any longer ask of the Source of Law to help him to make them! "*Tantum Irreligio potuit suadere malorum.*" Into such a dark labyrinth of sin is that nation led, which forsakes its ideal, and expands into freedom *from* Christ, instead of freedom *in* Him. But I only mention this class of man in speaking of the various forms of madness, by way of showing that of all those forms, spiritual madness, notably when found in high places, is the most dangerous and the worst.

Let us go on to consider, in such lights as may come to us, the importance of finding in Jesus the authority in the affairs of the soul, and also of the mind when brought up against eternal questions.

There is a class of mind, or rather say, a habit of mind common to all classes, which seems to delight in nothing so much as to fathom the unfathomable. Such are those at whom I have already glanced. There is no irreligious gluttony more vulgar and in vogue, with men of a certain class of intellect, and that, I need hardly say, by no means a high one, than to keep grabbing at that tree of knowledge of good and evil, which still brings forth its dead-sea apples in the midst of of the garden of thought, and in the most open walks of enquiry. It demands no great power of thought, or vast reach of imagination to be puzzled, for instance, by the sufferings of the just. Any fool at the first blush of the matter is led to fancy that here is some injustice. In fact a distinct act of piety, and a piece of express resignation, the remembrance of "Thy Will be done," is requisite to contemplate this common example of apparent wrong, and yet to make inwardly no graceless rejoinder. It is only the soul who believes in God, which in presence of such a fact, to take the most

crucial of all, as the sacrifice of the meek and lowly Jesus, can say with His Master "Thy Will be done," and can then expect the issue in repose. Yet, if He, the Christ, felt and said this about His own case, we may surely use the same language about ourselves, and about all the other less marked cases, which in this journey of life are brought under our ken. In this thing, above all, we had surely best look to Christ as the great Authority.

The fact is this: that of our imperfect conditions Faith is happily as much an integral part as our ignorance is. Are not these set over against one another for our great and endless comfort? We cannot in some things help being ignorant, but we can help being fools. We are to blame if we strap our best eyes with fresh bandages, instead of stripping off those which bind them already. The man who does not keep in exercise the divine faculty of Faith, which spiritual science shows to be the highest faculty we have, is pulled up by his human ignorance at every turn, and must always be in "hot water" with Providence, or with whatever Power his vain imagination, conscious of dependence, must set up in His place. The very purpose and use of Faith is to turn ignorance into bliss, and to give us tranquillity in the practical perplexities of life, with respect to most of which it were sheer folly to seek to be wise beyond that which is written in the experience of the world.

What a calamity it would be for us, if in this half-fledged condition we knew all about ourselves, and all that God is doing for us! In the mere attempt to do so how horridly as we have seen, do we shake our dispositions with thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls. We all know what a nuisance in society we find an over-forward and too inquisitive child to be—a child that is always teasing its elders and betters with questions beyond its years, and philosophising about matters which, if not in themselves unknowable, it imports that children at least should not know, and about which all wise and natural children of modest mind soon come to see that they must cease to make enquiry. But the last absurdity was reached by that child who said to its father "Why mayn't I say 'Why?'" And yet the father of that child was a man who made a point of satisfying every seemly and well-proportioned enquiry.

Well, the whole human race, including our friends of the kind of mad-intelligence I have spoken of, stands as a child towards Him, Whom, by leave of Parliament, and of all its honourable members/ Bradlaugh and the rest, we still proposeto call *God*, Why, even in the most common, familiar, and vulgar matters, we acknowledge the advantage of unconsciousness, and count ourselves fortunate not to know what we are doing, and whither we are going, content to be guided by Heaven. You are sitting, say, in a railway-carriage that is at rest. Another passes in motion by your side, You seem to move, when you know you are at rest, and the others seem to be at rest when you know that they are in motion. Nothing will persuade a child that it is not so, nor a man, till he brings his late learning to correct the sportiveness of sense. Again, sitting in your garden, you know that you are in motion, while you have every apparent reason to believe you are at rest. Did I say in motion? Why, you are being whirled along by a complicity, possibly, by an infinity of motions! You are a traveller on the grandest scale, You are journeying round your earth's axis. You are whirling round yonder sun with a speed not only unconceived but inconceivable. Yonder sun of ours is whirling again round some other sun, perhaps, as some have said, under the sweet influence of that little twinkling Hipsipyle who sits in the choir of her six sisters in Heaven; while she again, and we with her, may be wheeling with frightful velocity, suns and all, round or towards some other far-off star whose rays have never yet reached our planet with all its far-glasses and helps to vision! For life involves motion. In God we not only live but move, and all the Universe in all its ranges of actual and potential life is high-busy, and we with it, bent on the beautiful work of flying upon the bidding of our Father. Thus much of the Will of God we *must* do, and must abide, whether we have faith in God, or whether we, who are the first of his earthly creatures, choose to murmur and sulk, and let our lagging souls slink behind in this glorious and universal rivalry of implicit and unquestioning obedience.

But only imagine what a ghastly thing it would be, if we were so constituted as to be conscious, and sensibly aware of all these motions at once, of which, nevertheless, willy-nilly, we are, as we have seen, the blest but passive subjects! What brain could stand a tithe of such knowledge? Would not the lightning-flash of such a revelation, the moment it fell on our perception, blind the line of our gaze, and scorch up the mental retina of the most capable among men? Well did the sweet poet of Israel say: "Such knowledge is too wonderfu and excellent for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it." Why, would it not, I say, drive us clean out of the few poor senses that we have, even to feel more than we do, all the movements we have? We should never know whether we were standing on our heels or on our head. You would, indeed, in such a physical case as I have instanced, be irritated, confounded, and distracted.

But yet, believe me, even if you *could* thus, as for the sake of our argument we have somewhat wildly imagined, even if you could have your frail senses aware at once of all that complicity of motion, your brain would not reel with so dire a dizziness, nor would you be dazed and astonished with amazement so sore, as that which would come over you in this other case if, I mean, you could become, in your present state, and in your terrestrial framework, vividly conscious of half the

problems of life and mind, of good and ill (if there be such a thing as ill), of which, nevertheless —nay all the more—in helpless but natural unconsciousness, you are enjoying, while you allow yourself to do so, the combined and harmonious action. It was observed by the greatest orator, statesman, and philosopher of Rome—Cicero—in his Tusculan disputations, "Non valet tantum animus ut se ipsum videat." ("The mind has not so much power as to be able to see itself.") "At animus, ut oculus, se non videns alia cernit." ("But the mind, like the eye, discerns things outside itself, though it does not see itself.") Just as a person who is well is not conscious without a direct effort of will (which can even produce local pain) of any particular one of his vital organs, or of all the network of his nerves, so the mind, when sane, is not unduly directed to any of the intricacies of its own machinery. I say "not unduly," for God has given us, within certain limits, the power and the pleasure of reflection.

Now, why have I gone through all this, in some of which, at least, any and all of my attentive hearers, to whom it is also our duty to preach as well as to the unlettered, can follow me? You, at least, who are the advanced scholars of Dr. Pattenden, are not unaccustomed to these lines of thought, and you do well to go forearmed into the larger arena of the great University, where you often do yourselves and your master such high honour—you at least can follow me. Why, except to say with the more reason what the most rustic intelligence can understand, and understand perhaps better than some who occupy the place of the learned, namely this, that it is obviously best in all the difficulties of life and its conduct, to look humbly and thankfully to our Father Who manages all so wisely and so kindly for His children; and, in a word, to turn to the Rock from which our spirits are hewn, and the hole of the pit whence our bodily clay is digged. And with that view, I urge you to listen betimes to Him Whose voice is certainly from Heaven, for it could not have been from earth—to Him Who said to the wonder-stricken disciples from the bright cloud that overshadowed them, "This is my beloved Son; hear Him." *He knows.* Never man spake like this God-man. Christ alone speaks "*with authority.*" "Truly," as the centurion said under His Cross, echoing that voice from Heaven, "Truly this is the Son of God." We have lately learned among the laws of solar light which have been revealed to us—for science also has its late and lagging revelations—the astonishing fact, that beyond the atmosphere of our world, as of all other worlds, all is blackness and darkness, even till the eye again reaches the airy envelopes of other worlds, and catches the bright particular stars which are the sources, direct or mediate, of the rays that play upon its tiny pupil. And so we find it to be round all the circle of science, round every world of knowledge there is also a darkness which no knowledge can penetrate. We live and move and have our being upon the edge of a ring of precipitous and abysmal darkness. But, as we have seen to be the case in the fiery citadels of heaven, so we Christians believe it to be in the moral world; that, dark as its surroundings are in respect of the origin and workings of evil, and all the problems that hang about this enquiry, there abides above and beyond all a Paternal source of Light. "God is a central and Personal Sun, Who gives light to all, and borrows none from any, and in Whom," as Jesus shows Him to us, "is no darkness at all." In that Light Jesus dwells, "having no part dark," and from that light He speaks to us, and teaches with an authority which is unique. Well, to whom else shall we go? *Christ, our Saviour,* oh, dearly beloved brethren in Christ, *must, in all matters of the soul, be our great Authority.*

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1880.

WE are heartily glad to see that the Wordsworth Memorial Fund in aid of the Endowment of the Southwell Bishopric is every day assuming larger dimensions, under the indefatigable exertions of the Honorary Treasurer and Secretary. The object is nothing less than to ease the labours and prolong the life of the learned and faithful Bishop of Lincoln. Surely this is an object that will commend itself to every scholar, ecclesiastic, and patriot in the country. We say every patriot advisedly, because we hold that it is of vital importance to the country that the union of Church and State should be maintained, and we think that the Bishop of Lincoln, by his able speech on the Burials Question, nobly vindicated the right and expediency of the Bishops retaining their seats in Parliament. Religion is the foundation of morals, and morals are the factors of health and happiness, for we have the highest authority, as well as the teachings of modern science, for saying that every disease or infirmity arises from a breach of the Divine Law. The ecclesiastic should contribute to this fund as a token of gratitude for the advocacy of his rights. It was suggested at Leicester that every clergyman who signed the Address of Thanks to the Bishop, should contribute half-a-crown to this Memorial. If this were done it would produce £400. We are sure that every scholar will desire to prolong the life of so learned a man as the Bishop of Lincoln, and he cannot better express such desire than by contributing to this Fund. We ask patriot, ecclesiastic, and scholar to subscribe, quite irrespective of their views on the Burials Act. The Nonconformists as well as the Clergy had rights in this particular matter, and we are not surprised that the Legislature has construed those rights in the most liberal and beneficial manner.

LEICESTER CHURCH CONGRESS.

INTERNAL UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

By the BISHOP OF DURHAM.

(Continued from page 503.)

I have spoken of unity as affected by our outward relations with the State. Let me consider it next as affected by the state of opinion within the Church itself.

The existence of three schools of thought—I prefer so to speak of them, rather than as three parties—in our Church has now become the tritest of commonplaces. It is more important to observe that they had their prototypes in the Apostolic age; that, where a Church is vigorous and active, they must almost of necessity co-exist; that their co-existence is a guarantee of the fulness of teaching; that the loss of any one would be a serious impoverishment to the life of a Church; and that, therefore, it is not expedient to attempt to thrust out, or to starve out, any one of them, while at the same time adherence to the fundamental principles of the Catholic creed and loyalty to the Church in which they minister must be demanded of all alike.

Pleading as I do to-day for toleration, and even large toleration, I am bound to emphasise this demand as a fundamental qualification. At this time more especially the obligation is the stronger, because some seem to think that a Church can do very well without a creed, or at least without a creed to which its ministers are required to subscribe. Though I have the deepest sympathy with the motives and aspirations of some who hold this view, though I hold it a privilege to reckon them among my personal friends, I have not, and never had, any sympathy with the view itself. I do not understand a Church without a creed. I do not understand a clergyman standing up to teach in a church without first asking himself definitely what he is going to teach. I can see no other prospect before such a Church but vagueness, irresoluteness, inanity, confusion, decay. The motive power is gone. The bond of cohesion is snapped. Dissolution—rapid dissolution—is the inevitable consequence. So far as I have read history, no body ever has held together for long under such conditions as this.

If in the sequel I should find myself using the epithets "High," "Low," and "Broad," I shall only do so because they are convenient and recognised terms. But they are not good in themselves. The distinction of High Churchman and Low Churchman—so long as these two terms alone were current—was intelligible enough. It designated the greater or less stress which the person so styled laid on the Church—the collective body, the corporate life, as compared with the individual, in the economy of the Gospel. But the introduction of the term "Broad" has thrown everything into confusion. From the point of view indicated no third term was possible. The "breadth" of a Broad Churchman refers to something else. Thus the three terms have no common measure. Let us rather look at the three directions of thought, and try to see their significance.

The Gospel—the special message of God to man—may be considered in three different bearings; in its relation to the individual man; in its relation to the Church, the collective body of believers; and in its relation to all that lies without, to mankind and to the universe.

Having stated these three relations I have in effect stated the characteristic features of the three great schools which the Church of England at this moment comprises. It is hardly necessary to dwell upon this. In the revival of the English Church the Evangelical school was the earliest in time. The stress of its teaching was laid altogether on personal religion, the relation of the individual soul to God. Then came the Tractarian movement. The history, the constitution, the ritual, the laws, the continuous corporate life of the Christian body, with the corresponding duties of the individual as a member of that body—these were the special study of this second school. The range of vision was thus extended. But a wider field was still open for the contemplation of the Christian and the Churchman. All these problems of social and political life, all these unconverted heathen throughout the world, all these past ages of human history, all these manifold processes of nature—most simple yet most intricate—most minute, yet most vast—boundless in time and space—what do these mean? What is their relation to the Gospel, to the Christ, to the Church? The Christian, the Churchman must become cosmopolitan also.

In God's good providence these three schools have followed each other in the order which was most conducive to the well-being of the Church. I remember some quarter of a century ago listening to a sermon from the great Missionary Bishop of our Church and age, then in the zenith of his fame. To others he may have been best known as the Bishop of Lichfield; but to myself he shall always be the Bishop of New Zealand, for as such he left his impression upon me. In this sermon he applied, somewhat quaintly but with striking effect, the summons of the Apocalyptic messenger—"the Spirit and the Bride say come"—to the two lessons which the two schools of theology then prominent in the Church were commissioned especially to teach—the direct inward communion of the individual soul with God, and the functions and destiny of the Church as the Spouse of Christ. If my memory serves me rightly, he went on to say that the order in which these two messages were delivered to the Church of England was providential—first the Spirit, then the Bride. It was essential that the lesson of the responsibilities of the individual soul should be impressed upon her first. Otherwise the doctrine of the Church would assume a hard, stiff, mechanical form. It would tend to petrifaction, not to life. We may extend this train of thought to the third school—third in point of time as well as in logical sequence; which, when Bishop Selwyn spoke, had not yet attained to the consistency of a school, so as to claim a place by the side of the others. It might have been perilous to the firm grasp of Christian truth within the English Church if her members had indulged too freely in speculations on the relation of the Church and the Gospel to the external domain of thought and life, before she had mastered definite conceptions of their relations to the individual soul or to the Christian society. But the time at length came when these problems were forced upon her notice. The more intimate acquaintance with the wide-spread religions of the East, the fuller researches of history and archæology, the rapid succession of conquests in the domain of science, the multiplication of social and political questions owing to the intensified activity of public life in all its forms—all these were factors in the world of thought and action with which the Church must reckon. We may thank God that men were found within the pale of the English Church ready to face such problems. Here is the true *breadth* of Churchmanship. It is not laxity, not dilution; but it is comprehensiveness of vision.

I have said already that these schools had their prototypes in the Apostolic age. Of all the great centres in which the Apostles laboured, the city of Corinth, with its manifold interests, most nearly represents the intensity and variety of modern life. Hence it is just here that we find what we seek. "I am of Cephas." Here speaks the man who clings with fondness to the Church of the fathers, to the principle of historic continuity, to the traditions of the past. "I am of Paul." Here is the utterance of another to whom the whole Gospel is summed up in the conception of a personal relation to God, of a justifying faith. Lastly, "I am of Apollos." Alexandria was the converging point of all the streams of human life and thought in the ancient world. The function of a learned Alexandrian was to reconcile all these diverse elements in Christ. Apollos was the prototype of a Clement and an Origen and a Dionysius. He who said "I am of Apollos" was the Broad Churchman of his day. St. Paul tolerated all these schools of theology at Corinth. Shall not we tolerate them among ourselves? Only his proviso must be ours also—that Christ be not divided.

Tolerate them? Is this enough? Ought we not rather to welcome them? Ought we not to thank God for them? What is it that makes this Church of England, with all her faults and amidst all her perplexities, the most influential Church among the more highly civilised nations of Christendom? What, except that, while holding firmly the central truths of the Gospel, she has not broken with the legitimate thoughts and aspirations of any section of society? She is committed to no Syllabus; she is pledged to no condemnation of political developments or scientific ideas, which to-day have proved, or to-morrow may prove, to be useful or true.

Very many in this room are old enough to remember when the names of Maurice and Kingsley were looked upon with suspicion and dislike, almost amounting to horror. Perhaps a few are conscious that, if they had had their way, these men would have been branded and cast out of the English Church as heretics. How is it now? There may be some things in the teaching of either to which you or I could not yield assent. But on one point, I venture to think, there will be no difference of opinion—that these two men have done a work of incalculable moment in influencing the social and scientific aspirations of their age, and thus retaining them in subjection to the Gospel of Christ and in loyalty to this our dear mother Church of England.

And not only is the beneficent influence of each school exerted on the Church at large. It is felt very appreciably by the other two. It is impossible to enter the church of an Evangelical clergyman, however pronounced may be his opinions, without finding everywhere—on the building, on the furniture, on the music, on the ritual—the impress of those principles of decorum and reverence in public worship which it was the function of the High Church movement to inculcate. It is equally impossible to take up the work of any intelligent High Churchman and compare it with some corresponding work, written a quarter of a century ago, without tracing, in the improved tone adopted in the treatment of social or scientific topics—the labour question, for instance, or the epochs of geology—the marked influence of the Board Church school. This is another reason why, if you are wise, you will not attempt to cast out these influences, but will suffer them to work like leaven within. So long as they remain within the pale, they moderate, and are moderated, by contact one with another.

But why different schools, when the truth admits no difference? Schools are one-sided and partial; schools imply extravagance. The answer is, that we hold this treasure—the truth—not only in coarse, fragile, earthen vessels, but in vessels of limited capacity also. But the truth—the truth of the Gospel—is wide, is manifold. You or I, this or that school, cannot contain it all. If, perchance, we are mentally so constituted as to take comprehensive views, this comprehensiveness is only purchased, in our case, at the cost of some firmness of grasp. We do wisely, therefore, to tolerate divers types of thought and opinion within the pale, though by so doing we should tolerate some extravagance, and even some error. The price is trifling compared with the gain. The lessons are more direct, and the extravagances are tempered, so long as they come from within. By casting them out we magnify the evil and we minimise the good. But it will be said, "By your consecration-vow you pledged yourself with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word." I do not forget this. But experience has shown that to expel the teacher is not always the best way to expel the doctrine. Experience has shown that the erroneous doctrine often springs up with greater luxuriance where the ground has been cleared by the removal of the erroneous teacher. Experience proclaims that a patient forbearance, a discriminating toleration, a sympathetic effort to appreciate the good and moderate the evil is often a far more effective instrument of expulsion than the anathema or the excommunication.

So, then, after eighteen centuries we return once more to the old lessons which, taught then by the highest authority, have been confirmed now by the longest experience—"Let both grow together until the harvest;" "The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee; nor, again, the head to the feet, I have no need of you."

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE WORDSWORTH MEMORIAL.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—Owing to the response made by the signatories to the "Address of Thanks" to the Bishop of Lincoln, to the further proposal to give some more permanent and substantial shape to the movement, having been most encouraging, the committee would be prepared, on the suggestion receiving favourable consideration from the memorialists and others, to organize a meeting in London for the further development of the Fund. Should a fair number of the signatories and subscribers communicate their wishes on this head to their Local Diocesan Secretaries or myself in the course of next week, the committee would undertake to give notice the week following of a meeting to take place some time in November. G. E. WATKINS, Hon. Sec.

BURIALS IN FRANCE.

Sir,—At this juncture it may, perhaps, interest some of your readers to hear how the French clergy are placed with regard to burials. Lately I was talking over this subject with the *curé* of a large parish in Paris, whom I had the pleasure of meeting on his holiday tour, as well as with several of his clerical brethren. The Paris *curé* told me that the Paris cemeteries pre-

sent the fullest possible example of the "mixed" use mostly prevalent throughout France :—

"It frequently happens to me," he said, "to alternate with a Protestant pastor at burials in the common fosse; one of us going to officiate just as the other has finished at graves side by side." He added: "We Catholic priests consider that our benediction of each grave, at the interment, suffices for its consecration. We suppose the Protestants feel that their rite is of like avail."

The *curé* proceeded to tell of burials of members of families of mixed marriages, where one parent was Roman Catholic, the other Protestant :—

"In my parish," he said, "as throughout Paris, we have many families of mixed marriages. Where these are well-to-do they habitually have family burial-places. In such cases, we well know the sore, sad feelings that would be aroused if we made difficulties about interring all the members together. Hence we never object to that. I have often buried the Catholic members of such families, and the Protestant pastor has buried those of his flock in the same family burial-place. As for the fosses, so for such burial-places, we priests hold that our benediction at interment is sufficient consecration for the graves of our people."

The *curé's* remarks on the sad, sore feelings sure to be aroused by refusal thus to lay the members of the same family side by side in their last earthly resting-place were painfully illustrated by a case that came under my notice at Nice. There the system of separate Roman Catholic and Protestant cemeteries still continues. When making inquiries on the subject of burials there, the civil authorities told me they had recently begged the Bishop of Nice to allow a Protestant husband to be buried by his Roman Catholic wife in the Roman Catholic cemetery; but the Bishop declined. Both wife and husband had cherished the hope that their remains might rest together, and their children were most desirous to carry out their wishes. The Church was the loser by the refusal to comply with this most natural desire. In another case, at Antibes, where the two cemeteries are in one enclosure, separated only by a pathway, a member of our Church lies buried hard by the dividing path, his Roman Catholic wife having thus arranged in order that her grave may be as near as possible to his, on the other side of the path. Separate cemeteries are, however, the exception in France. Churchyards also, as burial-places, are fast becoming extinct. The vast majority of rural parishes —communes—are provided with one cemetery for all. A corner—frequently called the "*coin infâme*"—is kept for the unbaptised infants and suicides. But, with this exception, all who die in the commune have legal right to burial in the "honourable" portion of the cemetery, with their respective religious rites, or with none, if so desired. It is noteworthy, as our Primate's recent inquiries in Paris show, that wholly non-religious burials are extremely few. The Nice authorities told me they had never had occasion to provide for a "*Libre penseur's*" burial without religious rite. It must be added that the French law goes far beyond our Burial Bill in allowing addresses of all possible kinds and by all persons to be delivered at the grave—provided, of course, the public peace is not thereby disturbed; there is no limitation of such addresses to Christian topics, or to Christians. Such is the French law, and wherever the friends of the deceased insist on its being fairly carried out, the civil authorities sustain them. Practically, in rural parishes, under the dominant influence of Ultramontanism, the clergy sometimes try to get Protestants buried in the "*coin infâme;*" and, if the friends are poor and timid, they succeed. But if the friends know their legal right, and quietly insist on it, the clergy must give way. One painful case of this kind occurred, a few years ago, in a remote rural parish in the Isère department. The French Protestant pastor, who ministered to the flock scattered over a very wide district there, was called to bury the first of his people in that village; it was fifteen miles from his home. Knowing there was strong Ultramontane feeling against Protestants thereabouts, he provided himself with authorisation from sous-Préfet to call on the Maire to see the law carried out, if necessary. It proved needful; for, on arrival, he found the *curé* had ordered the cemetery-gate to be locked, and the grave to be dug outside the cemetery, between its walls and the high road. He, with the friends of the deceased, at once declined to accept this arrangement, and called on the Maire, who, accompanied by the gendarmes, had the gate opened and the grave dug in the honourable part of the cemetery, and the burial solemnised in their presence and in that of a large number of the villagers, who attentively listened to the pastor's address. But the effort cost him his life shortly after; the walk of thirty miles, there and back, with the long and trying exposure during the preparation of the grave and the service on a keen snowy day in winter, so knocked him up that he came to Nice only to die in rapid consumption. Happily, such a case is rare; but cases less painful in their results are not so infrequent in remote country communes as they ought to be. Happily, too, no such pitiful attempts to evade the law are likely to occur in our own churchyards. Judging from the tone of such French clergy as I have spoken with, they generally share the feeling expressed by my kind informant, the Paris *curé*, who said :—

"Of course, we do not like the 'mixed' use of cemeteries. We should prefer to have our own, under the control of our own Church. But, as that cannot be, we, as good Catholics and good citizens, quietly accept the situation the law has created for us and make the best of it."

As he thus spoke, I could not help feeling that his words were such as many amongst ourselves might well adopt, and that the example of the French clergy, placed in less favourable conditions than our Burial Bill has created for us, might help to reconcile some chafed spirits amongst us. It is well also that English Churchmen should bear in mind that if, whilst on the Continent, they should lose a relative, they can only, as a rule, lay their remains to rest in cemeteries where "mixed" use prevails.

Thus our carefully kept British cemetery at Nice, though it happens, by somewhat unusual circumstances, to be the actual property of the British church, and is wholly under the management of the governing body of the church—churchwardens and vestry, of which the chaplain is *ex officio* president—is yet equally open to all British subjects alike; and, for all non-Episcopalians who may prefer another Burial Service than our own, the highly esteemed Scotch Presbyterian chaplain is as free as our own clergy to officiate in it.

Vichy, October 16, 1880. L. M. HOGG.

The Rev. A. H. Mackonochie, vicar of St. Alban's, Holborn, on returning from America, finds that in his absence the fund for making good the loss he sustains by the sequestration of his benefice has so prospered that a guarantee of the sum of £250 per annum for three years, concurring with the period of his sequestration, has been realised by his friends. The value of his benefice is £150 per annum; so that he owes £100 a year for three years to the good offices of Lord Penzance. —*Church Review.*

Professor Plumptre's third edition of his "King's College Lectures on Elocution," will be dedicated to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, and will contain much hitherto unpublished information upon the subject of Clerical Elocution. In the appendix to the chapter on public oratory, will be found choice extracts from the sermons of well-known preachers, in the English and Irish churches.

The Bishop of Meath (Lord Plunket) writes :— "Although I sympathise in the main with the principle which underlies the Free and Open Church movement, and would specially desire to see our churches open throughout the day for private prayer and meditation, I fear that I am not quite at one with your association as to the universal application of the principle to the Church at large. There is room, as it seems to me, and there ought to be toleration, for more than one system, and the unreserved censure with which pew-rents have been visited by some appears to me uncalled for. Under these circumstances I have abstained from officially connecting myself with your association, and should not feel justified in allowing my name to be announced in the manner so kindly proposed by your committe. While so saying let me repeat that within reasonable limits your cause has my entire goodwill." —*The Free and Open Church Advocate.*

On Monday evening the anniversary of the Guild of St. Luke was held at St. Paul's, the musical portion of the service being rendered by the London Gregorian Choral Association, assisted by their brass band, Mr. R. A. Turner conducting, and Mr. C. W. Jordan presiding at the organ. This guild, which was instituted fifteen years ago by the late Mr. Robert Brett, consists of students and practitioners of medicine who are communicants of the English Church, its object being to promote and defend the Catholic faith amongst members of the medical profession and to promote works of mercy. At the present time it is about to undertake the support of a medical missionary at Kolhapur, in the diocese of Bombay. There was a large congregation, and the sermon was preached by Canon Carter, from St. Matthew ix. 5, "Whether it be easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Arise and walk." The rev. gentleman said it would be a serious error to suppose that science was opposed to religion; they were both of God and had their appointed places in His kingdom; but science had its boundaries, beyond which it should not attempt to go. The medical men followed in the Redeemer's footsteps in restoring the bodily power of suffering humanity, and assuaging sorrow through the power of His science; but he paused at last in the face of a mystery he could not penetrate. Then religion, and religion alone, based on the revelation of Him Who made us, must step in and solve the problem. Referring to the guild, Mr. Carter said there was a peculiar need for such a society in the present day, when controversies and conflicting opinions beset society on every hand. In a profession such as theirs, touching human life on its tenderest side, touching homes in their saddest hour, coming across individuals when they were most easily moved, this surely was a time when it behoved them to quicken their faith in the principles they professed and the God Whom they served.

Bishop Piers Claughton will hold confirmations on Thursday, November 11th, at St. Paul's, at noon, and on Sunday, December 19, at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields at three o'clock. It is requested that the names of candidates may be sent to the Bishop at St. Paul's, and that all communications be addressed to him.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alford, Rev. J. G., minor canon of Bristol Cathedral; vicar of of St. Nicholas with St. Leonard, Bristol.
Andrew, Rev. Thomas Prynne, rector of West Putford.
Bowen, Rev. Elias Jenkins, chaplain, Bombay.
Bridges, Rev. Charles, perpetual curate of Wacton.
Buckham, Rev. Frederick Holmes, minister of the New Church of St. John the Divine, Thorpe, Halifax.
Bury, Rev. William Edward, rector of Screveton.
Cockin, Rev. John Irwin Browne, chaplain, Bengal.
Craig, Rev. S. B., vicar of Warthill and Gate Hemsley.
Cross, Rev. John Edward, prebendary of St. Margaret-in-Leicester in Lincoln Cathedral.
Davies, Rev. John Silvester, vicar of St. James, Enfield.
Dickson, Rev. John Bathurst, vicar of Foxton.
Dombrain, Rev. J., vicar of Market Stainton, Lincolnshire.
Du Boulay, Rev. Henry Houssemayne, vicar of Newlyn East.
England, Rev. G. A., vicar of Warthill and of Gate Hemsley; vicar of St. Mark's Hull.
Fell, Rev. Henry Seymour, rector of Puddington.
Forde, Rev. George, curate of Clonegam (Portlaw), diocese of Lismore; vicar of Badminton.
Gray, Rev. Samuel, rector of Leconfield-cum-Scarborough.
Goff, Rev. Edward, incumbent of Collicstown, Meath; vicar of Stanton-in-peak, Bakewell, Derbyshire.
Greenwood, Rev. Sydney, perpetual curate of Wortley, Yorkshire.
Hillyard, Rev. Arthur, rector of Stoodleigh.
Hughes, Rev. Thomas Evans, rector of Challacombe.
Ivens, Rev. Charles Llewelyn, minister of Emmanuel Church, Leeds.
Johnston, Rev. Charles Smyth, rector of Sproughton, Suffolk.
Jones, Rev. Edward Douglas, vicar of East and West Looe.
Karney, Rev. Gilbert S., vicar of Sandown; minister of St. John's Chapel, Hampstead.
Kent, Rev. Alfred, vicar of Coln St. Aldwyn; rural dean of Fairford.
Lampen, Rev. S. P., vicar of New Wortley, near Leeds; rector of Tempsford, Bedfordshire.
Lawrence, Rev. Neville George Murray, chaplain, Freiburg in Baden.
M'Kee, Rev. James, vicar of Womenswold.
Monro, Rev. Hugh, chaplain St. Saviour's Cancer Hospital. Osnaburg-street.
Pettigrew, Rev. S. T., pensioned senior chaplain, Madras Presidency; vicar of Hatfield, Herefordshire.
Purcell, Rev. L. T., rector of St. Paul, Exeter.
Rawlins, Rev. J. Arthur, curate of St. Lawrence, Reading; vicar of St. Andrew's, Willesden.
Reid, Rev. William Cawley, rector of Coppenhall, otherwise Church Coppenhall.
Robinson, Rev. Edward, perpetual curate of Penrhos.
Starey, Rev. William, vicar of Horton-cum-Studley, Oxon.
Streeton, Rev. Robert Henry, perpetual curate of St. Mary's, Kingswinford.
Taunton, Rev. Charles William Sackville, vicar of St. Clether.
Vawdrey, Rev. Alexander Allen, vicar of St. Sithney.
Weakley, Rev. Robert Hopkinson, chaplain, Stocholm.
Whitmarsh, Rev. Robert T., curate of Holy Trinity, Cheltenham; rector of Carlton-cum-Ashby.

:o:

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Armstrong, Rev. William, at Royal-terrace, Weymouth, late curate of Iver, near Uxbridge, on the 14th inst., aged 35.
Barnardiston, Rev. Arthur, vicar of Metheringham, Lincolnshire, on the 15th inst., aged 45.
Bowyer, Rev. James, at Gravesend, formerly S.P.G. Missionary, Howrah, Calcutta, on the 14th inst., aged 70.
Briscoe, Rev. Richard, D.D., rector of Nutfield, Surrey, formerly senior fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, vicar of Whitford, and proctor in Convocation for the Clergy of the Diocese of St. Asaph, on the 17th inst., aged 72.
Fawcett, Rev. Stephen Glas, M.A., late rector of Willoughby, Lincolnshire, on the 17th October, 1879.
Gwillim, Rev. William Henry, at Buxton, of Maisonnette, the Philberds, Maidenhead, on the 8th inst., aged 28.
Hogan, Arthur Riky, M.A., at Southport, Lancashire, vicar of Watlington, Oxon, on the 15th inst., aged 48.
West, Rev. Temple Walter, rector of Tetcott, on the 10th inst., aged 67.

The Church of England Pulpit.

SOBRIETY OF DEVOTION.

By the Right Rev. W. WALSHAM HOW, D.D.,
Suffragan Bishop of Bedford.

Preached at St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday, October 10th, 1880.

"Be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer."—I. Peter iv. 7.

THE subject which I have set myself to treat this morning is that of sobriety of devotion, as fostered by the Church of England; or, in other words, the calm, holy, reverent spirit which the Church of England helps to form in her children. Now, first of all, what is devotion? It is the homage of the creature paid to the Creator; it is the spirit of man communing with God, who is Spirit. There must, then, be the sense of God's presence; and in all true worship there must be the frame of mind which corresponds with that sense. To me it seems plain that the spirit of one realising God would be very reverent, very solemn, and very calm. "Be still, and know that I am God." Outbursts of ecstatic rapture scarcely befit the sense of the awfulness of God's presence more than the formality of mere outward observance does. A tumult of unchastened excitement is little more in accordance with that sense of God's presence than the mechanical absurdity of the praying-wheels of Thibet. Everything set in God's presence must be real, true, solid, filled with the reverent consciousness of that presence. You will remember, my friends, the words in the preface to the *Christian Year*—"Next to a sound rule of faith there is nothing of so much consequence as a sober standard of feeling in matters of practical religion." So wrote one of the most saintly and most gifted of the sons of England's Church. Now, our Church gives her children no rule for private devotion, except, of course, that rule which orders the clergy to use the daily morning and evening prayer either openly or secretly. At the time of the Reformation there were certain books of private devotion provided; and lately the Lower House of the Southern Convocation has been engaged in preparing a book of private prayer. But it seems that at present the tone and spirit of devotion, which the Church of England would enjoin, must be gathered rather from her public prayers than from anything which she provides for the devotions of the people. What, therefore, we must now think about is the special character of the Prayer Book as a book of devotion.

Now, I think if I were asked what are the characteristics of the worship of the Church of England, as provided for us in our Prayer-Book, I should say first of all, *truthfulness*. Whatever of unholy motive, or of misguided action is to be traced in the Reformation—and of course we can trace both—it did set men sifting and testing both doctrine and history; it did engender a serious struggle for truth. The recklessness of legends and traditions offended against this instinctive desire after truth. I suppose in the Church of Rome very few care to question the baseless stories and no less baseless doctrines which characterise the popular devotions of that Church. Whatever the sense of honour and truth in private life—and who will deny it?—a jealousy of absolute truthfulness in the sight of God is not, I think, a marked characteristic of the popular devotions of the Roman Church. Well, thank God, on the other side, the barren poverty of a mere negative protest which suffices some, I am afraid, for a religion, found no favour; but the Church built up her whole system on really primitive and Catholic foundations; she set forth her doctrines from the first with no uncertain tone; there is a positive, definite, dogmatic teaching of the faith, together with an absolute reverence for the truth of God.

Next, I should say that *reality* is a great feature of the worship of the Church of England. Here, again, we shall best understand the meaning of the word by looking at the dangers on either side. On the one side the danger is formalism of mere external acts, of attendance on services not understood, of a minute and perplexing ceremonial. On the other side, the danger is of mere sentiment and emotion, a stirring of the feelings, with no very definite acts of devotion. Now, the Church of England would have all her services real, true, intelligent. They are framed for all. There are no services for the initiated; all are meant to take an intelligent share in them. They are your services, O people, quite as much as ours. Look at your confessions, look at your psalms; see how your Church gives you a large share in all her worship. Above all, look at her communion service, and remember how there is there recognised the priesthood of the people; how, when we make memorial before God of the one eternal sacrifice once offered, that memorial is made, not by the one solitary priest, but made by him in the name of the people and for the people, so that all present take their part in the great solemn act which is then performed.

Now I will tell you what I call an unreal thing; it is this: the tendency which I have seen to omit, or to cry down, at least, those parts of our Prayer-book which are of modern origin, of post-Reformation origin, just because they are so, and without regard to the real place and meaning which they hold in our services. Some, for instance, would like to omit the confession and absolution at the beginning, and to omit the prayer for all conditions of men and the General Thanksgiving, full as they are of glorious teaching, fitting as they do the whole

framework of our services, for the simple reason that they are not of the same antiquity as much of the rest. Also in regard to ritual, I cannot but protest against the bondage of what we may call a fussy, cumbersome, and unintelligible ceremonial. Surely the argument which St. Paul uses to the Galatians has its analogy in modern times, and I am afraid of the bondage to poor elements.

I would next mention the *objective character* of our worship, by which I mean the fact that it has its meaning and reality in truths existing apart from ourselves, and not depending on our own feelings or consciousness. This is, of course, especially the case in its realisation of God as the great object of worship. This feature would be opposed to all worship of the creature on the one side, and what we may call self-worship on the other. See how our Church sets before the people a belief in God's gifts. There is pardon in the absolution, and on the other side there is great danger in some cases of what we may call the errror of self-absolution. In our baptismal service there is the gift of God distinctly recognised. It is no mere subjective matter depending on the faith of those present. There is the gift of God, and of course it is the same in the holy sacrament of Christ's body and blood; what we are told to seize and hold is the faith in God's promises, an assurance that God is true, a belief that God gives and not a resting on our own poor miserable and deceitful feelings.

And now, closely connected with this, almost as a branch of this, I would mention the *historical character* of our worship. See how it follows in a great measure the Christian seasons, see how much our worship hangs, as do our very creeds, upon the life of Christ. Theology, doctrinal accuracy, is good and holy and needful; but there is something you know which comes before theology, and that is history. Theology would be a mere airy weaving of unsubstantial sophistries, if it were not founded on solid fact, great is the mystery of Godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. We build our worship upon history.

Once more I would mention *calmness* as a characteristic of the worship of the Church of England. as opposed to the sensuousness of scenic effect, or what almost amounts to voluptuousness of worship on the one side, and on the other the wild, irreverent excitement of ignorant fanaticism. I see many phases of religious life in the East of London, where my work lies. Well, I can honour all honest, even if mistaken, efforts to promote God's glory, but I know the pain and the sense of externality which comes to one in a ritual that appeals so vehemently to the senses that it is hard to realise anything beyond; and I know the pain and the sense of dishonour to God of the coarse irreverent announcements, at any rate, of some of those wilder and less chastened means which are adopted by some for rousing the ignorant and indifferent to some sense of religion and of belief in a God.

Well, now, if I am right in my description of the character of the worship and the spirit of the Church of England, surely he who rises to its full use, and drinks in its spirit, will be largely moulded and formed in all his habits of devotion—private as well as public—by this character and spirit. He will be sincerely truthful and natural, shrinking from exaggeration, dreading self-deception, simple, honest, real. Now, let me guard myself; we must not condemn all language in prayer or worship which rises above our own attainments and experience. Why, our Church, with all her truth-loving honesty of language, admits much which surely rises higher than our experience. See how it is in that confession in the communion office. Is it always true that the remembrance of our sins is grievous unto us—that their burden is intolerable? See how it is in the language of Holy Scripture itself. Look at the Psalms, whether of penitence or of triumphant praise. No, we do not want to pare down the language of our worship to the level of our own wretched experience. Only in using such language we want to know what we mean. We want to know that this is meant, that we should rise higher and higher, that we should look upon it as a standard to which we must ever strive upwards, that we should look upon it as something to humble us; aye, to give us, so to speak, a confession within a confession, showing us how little, as yet, we have learned our great lesson of holy worship. But the true English Churchman in his closet will believe in God; he will hold prayer accepted, not for its fervour or delight, but for Christ's sake; he will love to follow the guidance of the seasons of the Church; he will make his daily prayers, whether alone or in his family, full of Christ's life; he will make memorial of the Resurrection on Sunday, of the Ascension on Thursday, of the Crucifixion on Friday, of the Burial on Saturday. There will be a calm, quiet, reverent, holy tone and spirit in the sense of God's presence; and that sense of God's presence will not depart when he rises from his knees.

And just one other point. The worship of the Church will have taught him to love his Bible; he will search the Scriptures and love them because they testify of Christ. Now, I must guard myself against two things; first, against condemning as unlawful the use of books and forms of devotion not originating with our own Church. The Spirit of God is given liberally; we may easily shut ourselves up in a narrow insularity, and yet I would counsel a preference always for books of English origin, and great caution in using books of foreign origin. I especially refer to those borrowed from mediæval Rome, because they foster very often an un-English and unhealthy tone. Then, secondly, I would guard myself against being supposed to ignore the wonderful height of devotion which has been attained in other communities. No one can read such lives as those given to us of late in the beautiful

English of Mrs. Sidney Lear, without seeing how very saintly a type of devotion has been attained in the Church of Rome; while Baxter, Doddridge, Alleyne, and other Nonconformists have no less risen above their surroundings, and lived almost within the veil. It was at a recent Church Congress that one of the clergymen mentioned the case of a Wesleyan who had gained the power—oh, how it humbles and shames us—of spending five or six hours a day in devotion. No, it is not that we would deny the height of devotion reached in other communities, but that we would see in the calm, devotional spirit of our own Church a help to the highest and purest form of devotion which we know. It is hard to select from the many names which rise before one, but the very recounting such names as those of Ken, Andrewes, Hammond, Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, Hicks, Archbishop Leighton, George Herbert, Henry Martin, and John Keble; or of laymen, those of Nelson, Boyle, Evelyn, William Wilberforce, Knox, Joshua Watson, and the late Robert Brett, will suggest the type of the devout life, not demonstrative, not sentimental, not conventual, but simple, real, true, and practical.

After all, the test of a system is not in a few great examples Many of those men that I have named would have been great in any system. Rather its true test is in its adaptation to the wants of the many. Now, I suppose here some would demur; perhaps they would point to East London. They would ask how the Church services there meet the wants of the people. Well, I know how little vast multitudes can enter into our beautiful Church services. I hope we shall not be content with these. We want much simpler and more elementary work in our mission-rooms, and such other places, to educate the people, to lead them, by slow degrees, perhaps, but still to lead them on to the appreciation of the glorious worship of the Church. But this does not touch my position, which is, that where the Church has trained her children up there she gives them the highest helps to the devotional life. I know it makes one sigh sometimes to ask for tokens of the devout life in the rush and roar of this busy city. I know our services, our church-going, much of our decent propriety of observance, is skinned over with a mere vanish of respectability and compliance with custom. "There be many who say, Who will show us any good?" It is true the hypocrites of polite society are the ruin of many a halting soul; but God forgive those that put a stumbling-block in the brother's way. It is also true that God has His hidden saints,—"Yet have I left me seven thousand that have not bowed the knee to Baal,"—men of business sanctifying their toils by the consciousness of God's presence, and doing all things as in His sight, young men glorifying God by a steadfast battle against their youthful lusts, ay, living pure lives as many a young man does, thank God, in the midst of all temptations to impurity; gentle, devout mothers, training their children up in the simple old truths; pure godly maidens longing after holiness, and giving the freshness of their young hearts to the Saviour—these are perchance increasing. What means this stealing in of young men, every day, sometimes ten or twelve, and kneeling down in private prayer in my own city church? It is not the praise of men they seek, no one knows them there. What means this grand revival of continuous worship in this our city cathedral, so that no service, early or late, can be held here without a goodly band of pious worshippers? Oh, may God throughout all the dangers and difficulties of these dangerous and difficult days, strengthen the Church of England to train up a people not to hanker after a bondage from which they have been set free, nor to rush into a license of excitement which is dishonouring to God, and enfeebling to souls, not to be the fickle sport of every wind of strange doctrine, but to be more and more calmly, deeply, reverently devout, praying with the spirit, and praying with the understanding also —"sober minded and watching unto prayer."

"SAVED BY HOPE."

By the Rev. W. THOMPSON, M.A.,
Curate of St. Saviour's, Southwark.

Preached at St. Saviour's, on Sunday Evening, September 5th, 1880.

"We are saved by Hope.—Rom. viii. 24.

MARK the universality of Hope. Sorrow is universal, but so is hope. If the one covers the earth with its shadow, so does the other with its light. If the sun of cheerfulness and brightness goes down, leaving night to fling its dark pall over the world, lo! Hope, like unto the crescent moon, arises to modify and counteract the gloom. There is no man breathing without Hope. Yes, in spite of the stoutest bars that were ever forged, in spite of the heaviest iron doors that ever creaked on rusty hinges, Hope will enter the darkest dungeon that ever was built in the mouldy vaults of a prison; and no feeling of incongruity, no conviction, however strong, against its right and fitness to be there, nothing save death can ever expel it thence. Hope is a most artful and skilful special pleader—a most astute casuist, and wins its way to the most wretched bosom and the most despairing heart. Now, if Hope lives in such an uncongenial atmosphere as this—in a prison—surely we may expect to find it flourishing under circumstances more favourable; and such, I need scarcely remind you, is the case.

I. What is it, for example, that makes the student rise early and late take rest, voluntarily subjecting his mind to be tortured with the perplexities of his task? What is it that spurs his jaded energies, and enables him to persevere, although his brow throbs with pain, and his body faints through nervous exhaustion? Hope,—the Hope of at length qualifying himself to do some-

thing or say something that will prevent his life from being barren and useless in the world. He is "Saved by Hope," saved from the temptation to fling aside his books in sheer weariness and disappointment.

Look at that infant lying sick on its couch in the dimly-lighted room. The doctor enters and having looked at the attenuated form, and touched the flickering pulse, and listened to the shortened breathing, he shakes his head ominously, and turns away, giving no Hope. But in the breast of that mother, bending over her darling, Hope still lives on. She is "saved by Hope,"—saved from present despair.

Look again at that father as he places, season after season regularly, the empty chair for his erring but still much-loved son in the circle round the family board. All others have given him up for lost; yet still his eyes wander towards the window, or look enquiringly through the open door; and sometimes he ascends alone the brow of the hill whence he had seen the last sight of the diminishing figure of the poor wanderer, still expecting his return. He is "saved by Hope," a Hope that will not leave him until he embraces the prodigal in his arms, or until the cold earth embraces himself in the silence, and the rest, and the forgetfulness of the tomb.

What is it that enables the poor man to struggle through his poverty? Hope. What is it that sustains the sufferer in his agony? Hope. What is it that animates the courage of the fainting soldier? Hope. What is it that points the struggling honest man of business to brighter days and the goal of ultimate success? Hope. To deprive man of Hope would be as the extinguishing of the sun in the heavens. Hope, my dear brethren, is the world's Good Samaritan, pouring oil and wine into the wounds and miseries of mankind. Thank God for Hope.

II. In the next place, let us see how *Christian* people are "saved by Hope." I am ready to admit that a mere natural man, by the exercise of mere natural Hope, may *at times* triumph over his difficulties; but that is not the Hope, dear Christian brethren, that I should wish you to covet or possess, but something higher and stronger—a Hope not synonymous with a sanguine temperament and self-reliant, but a Hope fixed "as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast within the veil," fixed in the eternal calm in your Father's bosom, so as to defy every wind of adversity, every storm of temptation and passion. There are periods when nothing short of this "Hope" will sustain the believer; some crisis in his career in which he finds himself involved, or some trial looming in the distance and threatening him,—times when the unbeliever, relying on mere worldly resources, becomes powerless; when he must give up in despair, or cast himself upon a blind chance.

It may be that I am addressing some one here to-night who is in perplexity, one who is labouring energetically and in a straightforward and faithful manner to secure a competency, or to provide for the immediate and pressing wants of himself and those who are given to him, and made dependent upon him. His struggles prove unavailing; his means of maintaining his position are growing fewer and more shadowy every day; he is becoming less and less capable of meeting the demands made constantly upon him. The troubled waters are roaring on the sharp-pointed reefs ahead, and disaster stares him in the face. Well, my brother, this is a time, not for despair, but for Hope,—hoping in the Lord, committing your case to Him, and asking Him to undertake for you in your distress.

Or, perhaps, I am speaking to another, whose early life was rich in expectancy and full of promise of a ripe and abundant harvest of blessed influence and usefulness, but upon which the destructive blight has long since settled down; some one whose dawn was bright with sunshine, but as the day advanced, clouds began to gather and stretch across the sky, keeping back the genial warmth and obscuring the pleasant light, and leaving the path cold and dreary. Well, this is not a time to become morbid, and to love the shade as most suited to the darkened spirit, but rather a season for the exercise of Hope—Hope in God who can make the cloudy pillar, which now envelopes you, brighten up into the pillar of light, if He sees that that is the best and fittest way to lead you.

Or, again, there may be another whose way is not clear, who is beset with questionings and harrassed with doubts that *will* obtrude upon his mind in spite of himself. This is not an unusual case. There comes a time in the history of most thoughtful minds when the simple and beautiful faith of the child has to pass over into the robust and more practical faith of the man. This is a time of much shifting and shaking—a time of rocking and upheaval, not with a view to the demolition of the spiritual edifice, but for the purpose of placing it on a stronger and firmer and a more enduring foundation. Thousands have passed through this ordeal in triumph; thousands have come through this fiery furnace, by God's grace, with not a hair of the head singed, nor the smell of fire upon their garment. Take courage, then; hold on to that which *must* be plain to you, to truth, to goodness, to virtue, to love, about which there can be no mistake, and Hope in God—Hope that He will illuminate, in His own good time, that which is at present obscure and uncertain to your mind.

One instance more, and I have done with this part of my subject. Before me there may be a true disciple of Jesus in much sadness of soul (I have met and conversed and prayed with many such). He sees others rejoicing in a present salvation, and making much progress in the spiritual life, while he himself appears to be at a standstill. He has run after this preacher and that; he has consulted this man and that, and the end is no

better with him than the beginning. He has been told that Christ saves not only from the guilt, but also from the power of sin. But that fatal power is still remorselessly fastened upon him. He has read, "Sin shall not have the dominion over you," but he does not know this by personal experience. He is still perpetually making mistakes; the old temper still defeats him; the old evil passions still conquer him; the old besetting sin still trips him up and overthrows him, and at times he feels that he must abandon the conflict and give up in despair. No, no! struggling, battling, Christian soldier, still maintain the fight. True, the starless night is around you, and the storm is settling down upon the sea on which you are embarked, yet do not lose heart; cast out the anchor of Hope and patiently wait for the day. The boisterous waves and winds may not suddenly subside and fall, as they did not around that Alexandrian corn-vessel in which St. Paul was borne towards Rome; but yet be content with the hope of reaching land, like him and his companions, at last, even though it should be on the shattered spars and broken planks of the poor frail vessel of Faith in which you are now sailing.

And so, dear brethren, I might go on enumerating many other instances of trial in the Christian life, when nothing can save except Hope—Hope in God; turning-points in character or in circumstances when the soul finds itself in the position of the Israelites of old, with the steep inaccessible rocks on either hand, the deep treacherous sea before them. and the rattling of the chariot wheels and the resolute and impatient tread of the host of Pharaoh behind them. In such a crisis of life, when you have done everything you could to extricate yourself, and you can do nothing more, my advice is this, "Stand still and see the salvation of God." "Hope thou in God."

III. Let us now look at this subject from another point of view. We have seen how and from what "we are saved by hope," but there is another side to the subject. It is equally true, alas, that we are lost by Hope. The Antediluvians watched the progress of the ark in building from day to day, and listened to the voice of Noah, the preacher of righteousness; but they ridiculed his predictions, they jeered at his warnings, they laughed at his credulity. They hoped he was afflicted with a monomania for building a great wooden house, until at last the floods rose and pursued them to the topmost branches of the trees, and to the peaks of the highest hills, and swept them all away. They were *lost* by Hope—Hope that the future would bring no change in the current order of things.

The sons-in-law of Lot, I suppose, hoped that he had come through the dark and dangerous streets to alarm them with a fictitious story of impending doom, in order that he might amuse himself at their timidity, or perhaps they ascribed the strangeness of his appearance and manner to a fit of somnambulism. They hoped he was mocking them, and were overwhelmed in the hissing rain of fire that was poured on Sodom and Gomorrah.

Achan stole the wedge of gold and the goodly Babylonish garment, and hid it in the ground beneath his tent, in the Hope that his theft would not be discovered, and was stoned in consequence.

Gehazi ran after the Syrian Captain in the Hope that his greedy request could be kept secret from his master, and heard upon his return words that rang in his ears with the solemnity and hopelessness of a death-knell, "The leprosy, therefore, of Naaman shall cleave unto thee and to thy seed for ever. And he went out from his presence a leper as white as snow." White as snow! A man guilty of crime, to conceal it, perpetrates another of still deeper dye, and hopes he has escaped detection; when, just as he is about to drop the curtain upon the last scene of the drama, the voice of outraged law arrests him, and the colour flies from his cheek—white as snow!—as he feels that the trap of justice has closed with its iron teeth upon him.

It is Hope, the Hope of concealment, that encourages a man to take the first, and the second, and the third, step in sin; and this is the hope which, unlike that of our text, instead of saving, damns. This is the Hope which deceives a man, prompting him to put off the day of repentance and reconciliation with his God through the atoning blood of the Cross of Christ, until his last moments, when, in all probability, it will be too late; leading him to use up the whole light of the candle of life for himself, and then to offer (what an insult!) the dying flickering flames of it to God and His service at the last.

My brethren, the only true Hope, the Hope that will never delude and never betray, is that which shines from Calvary. The sacrifice of Jesus is man's only hope in life and in death. Embrace this Hope; it is the earnest of the "Hope of Glory." This, and this only, is the Hope "that maketh not ashamed."

Last Friday thirteen new students were admitted by the Bishop of Liucoln as members of the Chancellor's Theological Schools. The ceremony took place in the presence of all the students, in the newly dedicated chapel of the Bishop's Hotel. The admission was made after shortened Morning Prayer by imposition of hands, according to the form drawn up by the Bishop of Lincoln. His lordship delivered an impressive address to the newly admitted students, in which he dwelt on the fact of their being the first members added to the body since the opening of the new Hostel, and the influence, for good or for evil, their conduct might have on all succeeding generations of students. His lordship was attended by Precentor Venables, Chancellor Leeke, Vice-Chancellor Crowfoot, Canons Worlledge and Barrett. The members of the Theological School are forty-two in number.

We are requested by Mr. Willis Probyn Nevins, of Cheltenham, to announce that he has left the Church of Rome.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1880.

IS THERE A PRAYER FOR THE DEPARTED IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION OFFICE?

In his recent work, in reply to Canon Farrar (viz., "What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment"), Dr. Pusey says: "Prayers for the departed necessarily involve the belief in some possible change in the condition of the departed; and the extrusion of those prayers from our Prayer-book was owing to the unhappy declension towards the end of the reign of Edward VI. They are still legal, although publicly the departed are only tacitly included in the emphatic words, 'We and all Thy whole Church.'"

As our readers are aware, these words, "we and all Thy whole Church," are to be found in what is called by some the Prayer of Oblation in our Communion Office—"most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through Faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion." What is the full sense of these words, "we and all Thy whole Church?" There are many who summarily settle it by saying that earlier in the office we pray for "the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth," and that no other aspect or state of the Church is contemplated throughout it; consequently the words "we and all Thy whole Church" being conditioned by the earlier expression referred to "mititant here in earth" can only mean "we and all Thy whole Church militant here in earth." There is more of assertion than argument in this statement, and in order to see the force of the phrase under consideration we must look back to its place in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. In that book it stood in the Prayer of Consecration, in close connection with the passage, "We thy humble servants do celebrate and make, here before thy Divine Majesty with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make . . . . . entirely desiring thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that, by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ and through Faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion."

Now in what sense were these words, "all Thy whole Church," used in Edward's first book. In it we find the prayer: "We commend unto Thy Mercy O Lord all other Thy servants which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them we beseech Thee Thy mercy and everlasting peace." . . . . Accepting this then as an expression of the belief and practice of the Anglican Church of that period, regarding prayer for the departed, we would naturally take the words, "all Thy whole Church," as including not only the Church militant, but the Church expectant; and taken in "the literal and grammatical sense," this is the most simple and natural interpretation of them. The question remains, what is now the mind of the Church of England on the subject, does she now mean these words to be conditioned as has been noticed by the addition "militant here in earth?" Taken by themselves they are naturally capable of a wider meaning, which meaning they evidently at first conveyed to all those who used them, and which they still convey to some, *e.g.*, Dr. Pusey already quoted, and to the Bishop of Salisbury as the following passage from his Bampton Lectures bears witness:—"I answer confidently that the more times such Holy Communion is duly celebrated the better; the better for the communicating individuals, the better for the Church. Yes, the better for the whole body of Christ's Church, whether still militant in the flesh upon the earth or already passed away from earth to its rest in the paradise of God."

It is noteworthy here that in the Revised Prayer-Book of the Irish Church, the following Collect has now a place in the Communion Office: "Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, we humbly beseech Thee that it may please Thee of Thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, and to hasten Thy kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy Holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord."

If it be said, therefore, on the one hand, that the words "militant here in earth" condition the phrase, "all Thy whole Church," it may be replied by Irish Churchmen that their Liturgy contains a reference also to the Church expectant; and that they are consequently all the more justified in taking the words, "all Thy whole Church," in their "literal grammatical sense."

COURTENAY MOORE, M.A.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE WORDSWORTH MEMORIAL.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I should be glad, with your permission, upon the appearance of an additional list of subscriptions to our Fund, on behalf of the Committee, to thank those of your readers who have responded so kindly to the invitation to contribute to the Testimonial to the Bishop of Lincoln. Some public acknowledgment seems called for beyond that of simply stating from time to time, in your advertisement columns, that the Fund amounts to so much, since such and such a date. It is gratifying to note that the same rate of increase continues, as at first announced, and that there are at present no signs of a falling off in the subscriptions. When the Fund becomes more widely known, probably the weekly average increment of £25, will make a corresponding rise upwards. The Committee look hopefully for an influx of smaller subscriptions than those which head the list, from the majority, not to say the entire body, of the 15,500 clergy who signed the original protest against the Burials Bill; and a simple calculation would show that half-a-crown each from those who have not yet contributed would produce

£2,000, whereas our most sanguine hopes at first did not lead us to anticipate a higher sum total than half that amount which we then thought worthy of the occasion; but seeing that the sum required to complete the Theological Schools at Lincoln—£1,500—was raised within six weeks, chiefly in the Diocese of Lincoln, as a Testimonial to Bishop Wordsworth (an average of tenfold the weekly increment of our own Fund), we do not despair of ultimately equalling that amount, which would be no unworthy or unacceptable addition to the Endowment Fund of the New See of Southwell. I think the promoters of that Testimonial to the Bishop may well be congratulated on the result of their efforts, nor do I begrudge the diversion of subscriptions from our Fund into such a channel, though the promoters undoubtedly owe the idea on which they acted to the very same suggestion that originated our movement.

But our Committee has had to contend with disadvantages and rebuffs from which the counter-proposal was happily free. It would be ungrateful at the same time not to acknowledge frankly that the encouragement we have received far outweighs such disadvantages and drawbacks. And I will venture to express my sincere hope,—while I feel the injury done to our Church by recent legislation, as keenly as any of my correspondents—that time will bring more charitable reflection, and soften the adverse view of the question raised by our movement in the minds of those, not many I feel sure, who cannot realise the fact that there is a bright lining to the cloud which has just passed over our beloved Church. Nevertheless — though unconvinced by their argument—I would not for one moment question their right to give expression, after due consideration, to those adverse views to which I have referred. All I would say is, that if our Committee —which now numbers several eminent Laymen amongst its members—continue to receive so many kind assurances from Bishop Wordsworth's innumerable and admiring supporters, as have recently passed through my hand, we shall endeavour, probably just before the Advent Season, to afford them an opportunity of giving public expression to their sentiments in favour of our movement.

We ask patriot, ecclesiastic, and scholar to subscribe, quite irrespective of their views on the Burials Act. The Nonconformists as well as the Clergy had rights in this particular matter, and it is not surprising that the Legislature has construed those rights in the most beneficial and liberal manner. The Clergy, and Churchmen generally, will best take their revenge by facilitating not only the burial of Dissenters, but also the death and burial of Dissent itself. One way of doing this is to perfect the Church's machinery by subscribing to the Endowment of the Southwell Bishopric.

G. E. WATKINS, Hon. Sec.

———:o:———

THE NEW BYE-LAWS FOR SCHOOLS.

Sir,—The school attendance committees throughout the country are now mostly engaged in preparing bye-laws in accordance with the act of last session.

I was recently in the chair when the model bye-laws sent down for acceptance by the Department were submitted to us.

On examination, it appears that the Department now suggest the Fifth Standard instead of the Fourth, as the limit to be reached before a child shall be allowed to work. Surely this seems a needless tightening of the educational strings; and, if it were adopted in the Union with which I am connected, the result would be that the principal part of the population, in two or three towns in the union, would have the Fourth Standard under their existing bye-laws; the agricultural portion, under the new bye-laws, would have the Fifth. We altered the limit to fourth instead of fifth, and it remains to be seen how the Department will regard our change.

In the departmental bye-laws, the vague expression is, and "reached the Third Standard." We have ventured to substitute, "passed the Third Standard" —a term much more easy of definition and interpretation, though I greatly fear it may not meet with the approval of my Lords; but I felt sure the term "reached" would involve managers in endless disputes with parents, if it is to be read, as though it meant— "attained to the amount of knowledge required to pass the Third Standard," which, I believe, is the definition of the term at Whitehall; but surely not anywhere else.

C. W. MARKHAM.

Saxby Rectory, Barton-on-Humber, October 23, 1880.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS: HOW IT MAY BE STRENGTHENED AND MANIFESTED.

By PROFESSOR WESTCOTT, D.D.

In the endeavour to commend the thought of the Communion of Saints to devout reflection, I wish to say a few words upon the idea itself, upon the realisation of it, and upon the charge which our belief in the fact lays upon ourselves.

I. The idea of a communion of saints includes two main thoughts—the thought of a life wider than the life of sense; and the thought of a life under conditions different from those of earth. The communion is a communion of saints as saints, and not as men under the present conditions of humanity. It is independant of limitations of time and space, both in its range and in its fulfilment. Each thought is of the highest practical importance.

1. Of the many great conceptions which are characteristic of our generation—voices of God, as I believe, calling us to unregarded truths in His Word—no one is more characteristic than that of the dependence of man on man as well as on nature. We are learning, by the help of many teachers, the extent and the authority of the dominion which the dead exercise over us, and which we ourselves are shaping for our descendants. We feel, as perhaps it was impossible to feel before, how at every moment influences from the past enter our souls, and how we in turn scatter abroad that which will be fruitful in the distant future. It is becoming clear to us that we are literally parts of others and they of us.

Dependence is, indeed, an inexorable law of natural life. Our faith has anticipated the conclusion and hallowed it. Men must be dependent on one another. For saints this dependence is transfigured into fellowship. The believer recognizes that the power which acts upon him from without is the expression of a spiritual life. He sees that the image of Christ's body gives the truest possible view of the relation in which all who are "in Him" stand to one another. The one life, the one Spirit, by which they are united to their Head, united eternally, unites them in time to one another. In that divine vision life appears in the fullest proportions we can yet apprehend. We turn from the

living to the dead, and as we contemplate the splendour of the heritage which they have bequeathed to us, we confess with no unworthy self-disparagement that without them we are incomplete. We turn from the dead to the living, and as we trace the lineaments of a divine likeness in those about us, we give thanks without presumption that there are saints now.

2. Again, this vast life which reaches through all time is in its nature beyond time. We are constrained, in our attempts to give distinctness to it, to use the language of earth, but in itself the spiritual life, of which the Communion of Saints is the foretaste, belongs to another order. And however hard it may be to pierce the veil of phenomena, this is what our faith claims of us to aim at. Our efforts, in other words, must be directed not to materialising heaven, but to discerning the divine, the eternal, in earth. As it is, we too often communicate our own deadness to the creation, which is waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God ; and rest when we are bidden to enter the unseen. Yet we do not doubt in theory that we are immortal beings moving among the works of God, accomplishing His purposes, ministering to His glory ; and if the life which angels contemplate with eager desire is poor to us, it is only because we allow our eyes to be satisfied with the surface.

The teaching of Scripture guards us against this perilous blindness. The words of the Lord and of His Apostles assure us that eternal life is here. Our blessings and our struggles lie now "in a heavenly realm." "Our life hath been hid in God." "We have come to a heavenly Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born." The communion of saints in the largest sense, the communion of angels and men, of men already perfected, and of men struggling towards the crown which is prepared for them, is a present reality. There is one divine kingdom, and there are many worlds. There is one life which finds expression in many forms, but that life is greater, deeper than all.

II. How, then, can we realise it? The answer will naturally take account of the two sides of man's life. Each believer has his individual character, which must be hallowed as though he were alone ; and he brings this to the service of the whole body of which he is a part. The communion of saints must, therefore, be realised socially and personally—socially, to speak briefly, by commemoration, personally by meditation.

(*a*) But here as elsewhere the social life is the true starting point of the personal life. We turn then first to public commemoration as furnishing the occasion through which individual fellowship with the spiritual world is quickened and guided. And in this respect no one can fail to have felt how imperfectly our Kalendar reflects the divine history of the Church. We must ask when we look upon it whether we do indeed believe in the continuous manifestation of the Spirit, and claim descent from an ancestry of saints. The Apostolic age stands there without preparation and without sequel. The old dispensation finds no representative from among the heroes of faith, lawgiver, or prince, or prophet, Enoch or Elijah, Moses or David, Samuel or Isaiah. The new dispensation finds no representative from among those, who in Christ's name and by Christ's power brought modern life and thought into His service. A few names, a few events, indeed, which witness to an effort after a larger sympathy, still keep a place in it ; but even these cease with Hugh of Lincoln and Richard of Chichester, before our own Church entered on its characteristic work in the old world or in the new.

As a necessary consequence of this narrow range of the commemoration of saints among us, our type of saintship has been dwarfed and impoverished ; it has been removed far from the stir and conflicts of ordinary action. The kingly type and the prophetic type, the type of the artist and of the poet and of the scholar, have been put aside. We do not turn to those by whom these characters have been fulfilled in Christ's strength as the peers of martyrs and apostles. We do not seek in their examples the pledge of the consecration of gifts similar, however small, among ourselves.

And yet we cannot afford to dispense with the widest teaching of consecrated lives. We daily lose much by not placing these in their right position in the open teaching of the Church.

It is true, indeed, that every type of essential human excellence coexists in Christ, the Son of Man ; but we "who are but parts, can see but part—now this, now that." We have no power to apprehend directly elements which are combined with others in an absolute ideal. It is only through Christ's servants each realising, according to his nature, his endowments, his age, his country, some feature in the Christly life that we come to have a real sense of the fulness of His humanity. The many typical characters who foreshadowed Him find their counterpart in the many saints who offer for our welcome and our study the riches of His manhood. Nor do they in the least degree trench upon His inviolable honour. Their saintliness is wholly from Him. They are what they are, so far as we call them to mind and seek their fellowship, by His presence, He in them and they in Him. They have made Hi power visible ; and for this we are bound to commemorate them, and their Lord through them.

The neglect or the indifference of centuries, no less than the discordances which are found in every life, involves such commemoration in great difficulties. Yet our faith encourages us to face them ; and in many cases the solution will come through obvious channels. There are few parishes which do not include in their annals some names fitted to recall memories of Christ's manifold victories through believers. A dedication festival may not unfrequently lay open a fruitful page of Christian work. Our Cathedrals, again, are monuments of sacrifice and service which constrain us to recall Christ's working through those whose benefactions we inherit. Most of us, I fancy, have been deeply stirred by the commemoration services of College and University. We have wondered, perhaps, that the use is not universal. At Peterborough, in old time, to take one instance, almost every abbot had his memorial day, and four times in the year, in the Ember weeks, all were commemorated together. There is surely here something for us to embody under new forms of thought.

I should be the last to forget or to disparage the services of unknown benefactors. These have in a large degree made life for us what it is. These have their own commemoration when we recall the progress of the ages. But there are others who stand out as leaders, as representatives. Gifts, labours, thoughts of distinguishable ancestors go to swell our spiritual patrimony. It may have been by some conspicuous work which was nobly spread over a lifetime ; it may have been by some sweet trait which was just seen in a crisis of trial ; but here and there they have helped us, and if we are to enjoy the fulness of their service we must solemnly recall it. In doing this we arrogate to ourselves no authority of final judgment by grateful celebration. We recognise a blessing ; and, so far, we

acknowledge God's love in him by whose ministry it was shown to us. Nor would it, I think, be difficult to make a list of names from our own Church which all would accept as worthy of memory, names of rulers and scholars, of men who taught by their words and by their lives, who spread the faith and deepened our knowledge of it.

(*b*) Such commemoration of men, such peopling with familiar forms of the vacancies of All Saints' Day, such filling up the noble but blank outlines of the *Te Deum*, would help us to understand better, as a society, the vastness of the Christian life; but we require also the commemoration of ideas (if I may so speak) in order that we may bear in mind the new conditions of the spiritual life, which, as we have seen, are suggested by the belief in the communion of saints. And here one festival still survives by name in our Kalendar which completely expresses part of what I mean, the Festival of the Transfiguration. The Transfiguration is the revelation of the potential spirituality of the earthly life in the highest outward form. In that the present and the past are seen in a fellowship of glory; and the future in its great features lies open for consideration. Such an event, distinct in its teaching from the Resurrection, and yet closely akin to it, calls for more religious recognition than it receives. It is able, if we enter into its meaning, to bring vividly before us the reality of a communion of the living and the dead. Here as elsewhere, the Lord, as the Son of Man, gives the measure of the capacity of humanity, and shows that to which He leads those who are united with Him.

The festival of the Transfiguration furnishes an opportunity for bringing out the idea of the widest fellowship of men. The festival of St. Michael and All Angels furnishes an opportunity for bringing out the complementary idea of the interpenetration of human life by life of another order. And if it be true (and who has not felt it?) that "the world"—the world of sense—"is too much with us," then a remedy is here offered for our use. The reserve and the revelations of Scripture are equally eloquent. I will notice one point only, which seems to be practically overlooked. We commonly limit our notion of angelic service to personal ministration. No doubt Scripture dwells specially on this kind of office; but it indicates yet more, a ministration of angels in nature, which brings both them and the world closer to men. There is, I venture to think, something in this aspect of our subject worthy of attention. Perhaps one effect of the growing clearness with which we apprehend the laws of physical phenomena is to bring out into prominence the thought of the powers which work according to them. The sense of action by law places the agent very near to us. "I can see," writes one who was himself a distinguished physiologist, "nothing in all nature but the loving acts of spiritual beings." However strange the conception may be, it contains, I believe, truths which we have not yet mastered. And in this respect we commonly embarrass ourselves by mentally presenting all action under the forms of human action. Spirit, it is obvious, may act in other ways; and our festival of the heavenly order remains to help us little by little to apprehend in this larger sense the revelation of the Communion of Saints.

2. So far we have seen how public commemoration can supply examples and thoughts towards realising the Communion of Saints. These are made effective personally by meditation. And, to our great loss, the faculty and the habit of meditation have not as yet been cultivated among us. Our national character, and, at present, the prevailing spirit of realism are alien from it. Yet the praise to God's glory which comes through the devout consideration of His action in men is true work. This is the subject for spiritual meditation; and periods of quiet retirement may be made available for pursuing it.

But, as it is, we are apt to dwell on the littlenesses of men, or, if not, upon the picturesque aspects of their lives, to bring them down in some measure to our level, and not to aspire to their highest.

It is, however, through such aspiration alone, quickened by the thoughtful study of that which the Spirit wrought in them, that we can enter into fellowship with their true life. Weaknesses, faults, errors, accidents of time and place, fall away. We learn to look upon the love, the courage, the faith, the self-sacrifice, the simplicity of truth which they embodied, and so become invigorated by vital contact with the eternal manifested through men. We rise, so far as we can rise under the pressure of earthly limitations, to some perception of the heavenly life, in which all that is personal is gathered up without the loss of personality in One, even "in Christ."

This fellowship of spirit with spirit is closer, and may be more powerful, than the precious fellowship which we can hold with books. That leads to this. The record of a life imaged in word and deed, the energy of a life shown in thoughts grasped and made ready for use, help us to gain an energetic sympathy with those who have laboured and written for the truth.

And there is no limit to this inspiring communion. It embraces the living and the dead. It acknowledges no saddest necessity of outward separation as reaching to the region in which it is. It does not even seek for the confirmation of any visible pledge. It makes possible that unity of inward love to which final conquest is promised. It rests on that which is the source of action. It imparts to the believer something of the strength of every victory of faith. For by saints we understand all who welcome and appropriate and show forth, in whatever way, the gifts of the Spirit. We look to the one life, flowing from the one Paraclete, and, by tracing the manifoldness of His action, gain strength for our own task.

In this case also special circumstances will serve to determine the peculiar objects of our meditation. Our position, our duties, our temptations, our endowments, will influence our choice. If we are ready to follow, Christ, through the Spirit sent in His name, will guide us to some one in whom we may study the virtue of His presence.

And in this connection I cannot forbear to notice the possible influence of what we speak of, with too little reflection, as Christian names. They are indeed, and they can be treated as, the dedication names of each believer.

Meditation on the saintliness of saintly men must be supplemented by meditation on angels, as the representatives of the unseen world, if we are to feel the full extent of the Communion of Saints. We cannot, it is true, presume to press such meditations into detail. It is enough if we recognise the service, the sympathy of "the host of heaven;" if we consider all that is implied in the most familiar and solemn words by which we claim to share their hymns of divine praise in our highest act of thanksgiving and communion.

III. Briefly, then, to sum up in another form what has been said, we must, as far as we may be able, both in public service and in private thought, present and dwell upon the greatest facts, the greatest aspects of

things, the greatest truths, refusing to rest on the transitory and temporal, if we are to realise, as we can do, the Communion of Saints, the fulness of the manifestation of the spiritual life, and its eternal power.

The familiar example of hymns will show beyond question what a capacity there is in this treatment of our faith, without any suppression of individual convictions, to unite, to elevate, to inspire, by unseen forces, those who are kept apart by intellectual and material obstacles. A hymn-book is a confession of the communion of saints.

Nor can we forget that the charge to strive after the fulfilment of this article of our creed is laid specially upon us. It is peculiar to the Western Creed, and it dates from an era of transition. The recollection of the old Empire, the anticipation of a new Empire, stirred the souls of men in the eighth century to proclaim a personal force of undying life in the spiritual society. It was not enough for them to acknowledge their belief in a Holy Catholic Church as a great fact: they felt that it must be a source of power; and that conviction they have handed down to us that we may realise it now, when some aspects of the continuity and solidarity of life have been made more evident than in earlier times. Modern science has given us forms which we can animate.

There is, indeed, a danger as well as a use in the contemplation of great ideals. If they lift us for a while above the strife of details, they may unfit us for dealing with the concrete questions which arise in daily work. But this ideal of one spiritual life, seen in its many parts through the ages and everywhere around us, made our own by the Communion of Saints, seems to me to be most practical in its influence. The one ground of union is the possession of a common life, and not any nicely calculated scheme of compromise. To see the life even from afar, to look towards it, is in some degree to reach a serener atmosphere, to feel the true proportion of things, to gain the earnest of an interpretation of the mysteries by which we are perplexed.

This thought of a life eternal, underlying, so to speak, the fleeting phenomena of sense, not future so much as shrouded, is characteristic of Christianity; it is included in the fact of the Incarnation, and it meets our present distress and disharmony with a message of hope. I say "our present distress;" for do we not all sorrowfully admit that the elements of our being are unreconciled, that there is on all sides a strenuous occupation with the outside of things which tends to destroy real reverence; that even the highest religious faculties are engaged or distracted by external details? To such discordance and unrest and triviality the sense of a present fellowship in an existence infinite in its variety, one in its essence, divine in its spring and issue, brings the appropriate and adequate help.

Man is made to seek for the rest which it provides. Most of those who hear me will remember the magnificent myth in the *Phædrus*, in which Plato seeks to explain the origin of the highest forces in our earthly being. On stated days human souls, he says, follow in the train of the gods, and rising above the world gaze on the eternal and the absolute. It is only by vigorous and painful endeavour that they can gain for a brief space the vision, which is the appointed food of diviner natures. Then they fall to earth, and their bodily life corresponds with the range and clearness of the celestial impressions which they retain. So they recognise about them during their earthly sojourn the images of higher things, and again strive upwards.

For us the revelation of Christ has made this dream a truth. In Him we see perfect sacrifice, perfect truth, perfect wisdom, perfect love; and having seen it we can discern signs of His Presence in those who show His gifts. He gives unity, and they reveal to us His fulness. In our kinsmanship with them we welcome the pledge of a life which is beyond time. Meanwhile, it is a blessing to acknowledge, once and again, a spiritual master. We grow stronger by the devotion of loyal discipleship. We "see the light and whence it flows," the light which is life eternal; and the Communion of Saints, with its manifold supplies of strength, with its boundless wealth of promise, becomes a fact of immediate experience.

———:o:———

The Lord Chancellor has presented Canon Elwyn, vicar of Ramsgate, to the valuable living of East Farleigh, vacant through the death of the Rev. Thomas Watson. Mr. Elwyn, who was formerly one of the masters of Charterhouse School, and Prebendary of York from 1871 to 1873, was appointed to Ramsgate in 187-, and made an Hon. Canon of Canterbury in 1879.

On Friday week a harvest thanksgiving service was held in the dining-hall of Messrs. Copestake, Hughes, Crampton, and Co., the Manchester warehousemen, where a chaplain, the Rev. W. J. Jomini, conducts daily service. There were some very effective floral decorations both in the approaches and also in the hall where the service was conducted. The Hon. and Rev. W. H. Fremantle, of St. Mary's, Bryanston-square, delivered an address on the subject of the festival, and at the close of the service the offerings were given to the Commercial Travellers' School. The service consisted of a shortened form of Evensong, the *Te deum*, and three hymns, all of which were sung with great heartiness by all present.

The Bishop of Oxford has re-opened the parish church of Hungerford, which has undergone extensive alterations and improvements. The original church seems to have been an edifice of considerable architectural protensions, but in 1816 it was replaced by a structure in the Gothic of the period, built under a private Act of Parliament. The outlay on this latter is said to have been no less than £30,000; but the effect was by no means commensurate with this large sum. The church has now been recast at an expenditure of about £3,000, of which, however, more than £500 has been devoted to the organ. At the opening service the vicar, the Rev. J. B. Anstice, officiated, and the Bishop was the preacher. At the luncheon his lordship said he did not like introducing debateable questions, but he felt he must speak to them, now that so many clergy were present, upon one subject—the Burials Bill. He quite felt that he had not carried the feelings of all the clergy with him, but he thought that if they looked at the matter from a distant point of view, they would see it was the result of a long struggle. Let them not assert their authority too much, but let them take it kindly, remembering what Church authority was in its highest sense. No Burials Act would have been required but for the fact that Dissenters existed, and he exhorted the clergy, therefore, to use their personal influence among their friends and acquaintances, that they might gain the goodwill and fellowship of those who were at present outside the Church.—It is proposed to place a brass plate under one of the stained-glass windows, with an inscription stating that the window was placed there by twelve former curates of the parish, as a testimony of their respect for the vicar.

The Rev. E. S. T. Daunt, vicar of St. Stephen, aunceston, stated at a Liberal banquet at Launceston that some time ago, having previously informed his Bishop that he believed that there was no law against it, he had asked Mr. Spurgeon to preach a harvest festival sermon in his church, but he had declined owing to ill-health.

On Monday, at the annual conference of the archdeaconry of Coventry, in connection with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, at Leamington, Archdeacon Mackenzie, Bishop-elect of Zululand, spoke hopefully respecting his diocese, and mentioned that he intended building a memorial church at Isandlana and establishing a station at St. Andrew, near John Dunn's residence.

The body of a Roman Catholic named Hannah Steel has been interred in the parish churchyard, at Stoke-on-Trent, according to the ritual of her Church. The deceased was not a parishioner of Stoke, but her husband, who was a Protestant, was buried in the parish churchyard some years ago, and permission for the burial was readily accorded by the rector of the parish, Archdeacon Sir Lovelace Stamer.

An address is in circulation among the beneficed clergy in the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol to the Rev. P. G. Medd, rector of North Cerney, Honorary Canon of St. Albans, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans, late Senior Fellow of University College, Oxford, &c.. requesting that he will allow himself to be nominated for the Proctorship vacant by the death of the late Canon Barlow. It has received already upwards of ninety signatures.

On Thursday Archdeacon Lightfoot re-opened the parish church of Cold Higham, Northants. It had fallen into a bad condition, but, through the exertions of the rector, the Rev. W. A. Howes, it has once more been made worthy of the high architectural reputation of the county. The operations have included the rebuilding of the chancel, the removal of the gallery, the restoration of the Potcote chapel, and other important works, which have been carried on under the direction of Messrs. Law, of Northampton. The cost has been about £1,800. The church is henceforward to be free and open.

We have been requested by the Rev. James J. Merest to insert the following letter addressed to him by the Bishop of Worcester :—"Hartlebury, Kidderminster, Oct. 4, 1880. Rev. Sir,—I am willing that you should officiate in any parish in the diocese of Worcester in which you can find a curacy. I am willing also that you should, even without producing the usual letters or testimonials from three beneficed clergymen, which I fear it would be difficult for you now to obtain. It would give me great pleasure to see you regain your position, and I am glad to give any help that I can for that purpose.—H. WORCESTER.—Rev. James J. Merest, 50, Burlington-road, Bayswater, W."

Speaking at a Bible Society meeting at Manchester on Monday, Bishop Frazer observed that in the last century a Bishop of the Church of England wrote a book, to which he gave the title "An Apology for the Bible," and the simple-hearted King who was then reigning, on seeing the book, said, "God bless my soul; I didn't know the Bible required any apology!" Unhappily things had got to that state that the Bible again required an apology—that was to say, a defence. Frederic Harrison might say that if upon what he called the synthesis of minds he selected from the writings of Hume, Confucius, Voltaire, as well as from King David, St. Paul, St. John, or even Christ, he should get a sort of conglomerate of the best thoughts that ever passed through the human heart or the human mind which would be very much more effective for the purpose of civilisation and purposes of human development than from that old book which we called the Word of God. But what we knew as a fact was, that the present civilised state of the world—civilisation in the highest sense of the word—had been built upon an acceptance of the Bible. Sweep away the Bible and all that the human race had learned from it, and what did they leave men to guide their steps through this difficult world? He had no patience with people who would rob them of what had proved to be a source of strength and of comfort, and who were giving them nothing to supply its place.

On Sunday afternoon, by the invitation of Bishop Piers Claughton, Chaplain-General of the Forces, the Tower Hamlets Rifle Brigade attended divine service at St. Paul's. The Volunteers were admitted first, and took up the places assigned for them. Meanwhile an immense number of persons waited for admittance at the west end of the church, and when the doors were opened there was a disgraceful rush for places. The anthem was "Come, ye children" (Sullivan). Bishop Claughton preached the sermon, and before the benediction the hymn, "Soldiers of Christ, arise," was sung. The Volunteers left the building in the most orderly manner, and were formed on the space fronting the main entrance, whence they returned to headquarters and were dismissed.

A Missionary Conference in connection with the Society for the Promotion of the Gospel will be held in the Assembly Rooms, Southwell, on Thursday, the 11th of November. After service in the minster, Earl Manvers will take the chair, and the morning session will be devoted to discussions on the claims and work of the venerable society, especially in the colonies; and the organisation of parochial missionary and ladies' associations. At the afternoon session the Bishop of Nottingham will preside, and the subjects for discussion will be India; the home supply and training of men and women for the foreign Mission field; and medical missions. The invited speakers include Lord Nelson, Dr. Alfred Meadows, Precentor Venables, the Revs. J. H. Simpson, H. T. Fountaine, A. F. Ebsworth, Dr. Strachan, S. Jackson, Canon Crowfoot, and A. C. Alington.

On Thursday week a harvest festival was held in the chapel of St. Marylebone Workhouse and Infirmary, when the sermon was preached by the Bishop of North Queensland. The prayers were read by the Rev. A. J. Buss, the chaplain, and the Lessons by Mr. C. Caron Buss. The inmates joined heartily in the service, especially in the singing of the harvest hymn, "We plough the fields and scatter," and the *Te Deum*, which was chanted after the sermon. The festival was continued over Sunday, when the sermon was preached by the chaplain. Many kind friends contributed fruit, flowers, and corn of all kinds, with which the chapel was very tastefully decorated. The master and matron took great interest in the occasion and supplemented materially the kind exertions of those who were engaged in beautifying the chapel. There were present at the service on Thursday eleven officers and five hundred and sixty-nine inmates. In the course of the week the fruit was distributed among the sick and infirm in the workhouse and infirmary.

The Chaplain-General of the Forces (Bishop Piers Claughton) will probably pay an official visit to Malta and Gibraltar before the end of the year.

The Bishop of Hereford has admitted the Rev. Edward ffarington Clayton, rector of Ludlow, to the prebend of Putstow Major in Hereford Cathedral, vacant by the death of the Rev. Harry Lee.

Bishop Ellicott has appointed the Rev. Alfred Kent, vicar of Coln St. Aldwyn's, and formerly Minor Canon of Gloucester Cathedral, to be Rural Dean of Fairford, in the place of the late Canon Barlow.

We are glad to learn that a site has been secured for a new church at Bournemouth, in which the victims of Low Church persecution may have the worship and teaching which they have enjoyed for the last thirty years.—*Church Times.*

The *Nineteenth Century* contains a delightful article by the Lord Chief Justice on "The Chase; its History and Laws," which may be read with profit and pleasure alike by legislators and sportsmen. It is not a mere dry, legal discourse, but, on the contrary, is lively and brilliant. Sir Alexander Cockburn suggests that the curious fact that Jews "do not appear to have availed themselves of the service of the dog in the pursuit of game" may be accounted for by the Levitical prohibition against eating anything torn—quite a new idea on this subject.

The following inscription in brass has been affixed to what the *Record* calls the "semi-Episcopal" throne in St. James's Church, West Derby, Liverpool:—"This Episcopal chair of state, with the dais and desk, were *(sic)* presented to the Church of Saint James, West Derby, by Catharine Barton, of Liverpool, in honour of the Right Reverend John Charles Ryle, D.D., the first Lord Bishop of Liverpool. Robert Salthouse, F.R.G.S., incumbent."

The Congress correspondent of the *Church Times* says:—"A gentleman in Leicester told me he had very carefully examined the registrar's returns for the three years 1877-79, and he found that in Leicester were during those years 14,229 births, whereas the baptisms during the time amounted to only 9,218. Of these 7,770 were by Church of England clergymen, 264 by the Roman Catholics, and 1,184 by Nonconformists; this last number including adults belonging to the Baptists. The fact that about one-third of the children born in Leicester are unbaptised is startling enough, and there is no reason to suppose that this town is worse than any other town in this respect."

Mr. Sims Reeves, the eminent tenor, has presented to the Rev. Chancellor Tisdall, one of his oldest friends in Ireland, a large and handsomely-embossed silver cup in memory of his farewell professional visit to that country. The cup bears the inscription: "To Charles Edward Tisdall, from his friend, Sims Reeves. October 14th, 1880." The foregoing date was that of Mr. Reeves' final concert at the Exhibition Palace, Dublin.

The first Diocesan Conference was opened on Tuesday at Gloucester, and the Bishop Ellicott, who presided, siated his wishes with regard to the Burials Act, which he hoped would be frankly and loyally carried out. The clergy should not recede from their position as guardians and trustees of churchyards, but they should be thoroughly conciliatory in the exercise of their rights, making no distinctions between Churchmen and Dissenters. The use of the church, however, should be limited to Churchpeople. A general concurrence to the Bishop's counsel was expressed.

The visit of a Church Congress to a town is generally attended by a considerable increase in the zeal and activity in the neighbourhood. At Newcastle the very prospect would seem to be having its effect, for last week a meeting was held to consider the propriety of building a new church in the parish of Shieldfield. The Vicar of Newcastle (Canon Martin) explained that 18,000 was the very lowest calculation that could be made of the population, and the actual accommodation of the parish church was only 620. This was not the only case of the kind in Newcastle. St. Stephen's contained no less than 21,000, with one church; St. Andrew's, 15,000, with one church; Benwell, upwards of 10,000, with one church; and Jesmond was very large, and daily increasing. During Bishop Baring's Episcopate only four churches, accommodating 1,850 persons, were built in Newcastle, so that the town had not been overburdened with the cost of church extension, and there was need of great and persistent efforts to overtake the wants of the people. Bishop Lightfoot, who presided, and said that these statistics were positively appalling, subscribed £100 towards the work.

—:o:—

In the sermon on "The Great Authority," last week, on page 508, line 9, omit *we;* on page 509, line 9 from bottom, for "moves" read *mouths;* page 511, line 17 from top of 2nd col., for "Hypsipyle" read *Alcyone.* A few other obvious errors will, it is begged, be excused, owing to miscarriage of proofs.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bourne, Rev. G. D., rector of Weston Subedge; honorary canon of Gloucester.
Clayton, Rev. E. ff., rector of Ludlow; prebendary of Putston Major in Hereford Cathedral.
Dickson, Rev. John Phillips, curate of St. Stephen's, Rashcliffe, Yorks; rector of Cumberworth, Yorks.
Fowler, Rev. Charles Augustus, rector of Walton-in-Gordano and Weston-in-Gordano.
Hervey, Rev. Frederick Alfred John, rector of Sandringham-with-Babingley; rector of West Newton.
Houghton, Rev. E. J., vicar of Blockley; rural dean of Blockley.
Hughes, Rev. Herbert Thomas, vicar of Christ Church, Emery Down.
Howard, Rev. William Waltham, vicar of Blackmore; rector of Market Deeping.
Kelly, Rev. F. F., curate of SS. Michael and All Angels', Paddington; vicar of Camberwell.
King, Rev. J. F., rector of Little Braxted; vicar of St. John's, Colchester.
Millar, Rev. J., vicar of Cirencester; honorary canon of Bristol.
Robertson, Rev. David, rector of Hartlebury; rural dean o Kidderminster.
Tomkins, Rev. William, curate of St. Stephen, Barbourne, Worcester.
Witts, Rev. F. E. Broome, vicar of Norton.
Wylde, Rev. Robert, rector of Northfield, Birmingham.

—:o:—

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Boucher, Rev. Henry, at his residence, Thornhill House, Stalbridge, Dorset, on the 25th inst., aged 83.
Folingsby, Rev. George, at 29, North Albert Street, Aberdeen, on the 17th inst., aged 44.
Goodenough, Rev. R. W., at Whittingham Vicarage, Alnwick, Northumberland, on the 21st inst., aged 71.
Poggi, Rev. Dominic Joseph, D.D., at Audlem, Cheshire, head master of Audlem Grammar School, late principal of New Brighton College, near Liverpool, on the 15th inst., aged 69.
Seymour, Rev. G. T., LL.D., at Warberry Hill, Weston-Super-Mare, on the 14th inst., aged 88.
Smith, Rev. Sydney, very suddenly, at St. Peter's Vicarage, Tunbridge Wells, for twenty-six years vicar of Worth, near Sandwich, Kent, on the 20th inst., aged 73.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE REASON OF THE ATONEMENT.

By the BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, October 24th, 1880.

"Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors."—Matthew vi. v. 12.

He who taught us these words is more than a Teacher. He is more to us even than a divinely inspired Teacher. We regard Him, in common with the whole Catholic Church throughout the world we receive Him, as our divine Redeemer and Mediator. We believe that He has come to us in mercy to tell us that we may approach to the Father, and not only that, but to make our approach possible. We believe that He has come not only to reveal to us the way, but come to be Himself that way. "I am the way, the truth and the life. No man cometh unto the Father but by me;" and, "Whatsoever you shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you." That is the teaching of our Lord, and that has ever been the teaching of His Church. In compliance with His own teaching, the Church in her teaching has ever placed Him where He has claimed to place Himself—between the human soul and God. She holds that there is a necessity that we should have access to the Father, and she proclaims through Him each one of the great truths committed to her—among them the doctrines of the Atonement and of the Intercession of our Lord are inseparably connected with the great central faith of the Church's belief in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Christianity does not call upon us to believe in the stupendous mystery of God becoming man without adequate reason for it. The publication of a new religion would be no sufficient reason; that might need an inspired teacher, not an incarnate one: that might need a Moses, but it could not need a Christ. My brethren, it is this—the Church when she proclaims her belief in the incarnate Christ expresses her belief in the doctrine that "God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and not imputing their trespasses unto men." And as she tells this in her great voice, she declares that "for us men, and for our salvation, the very God of very God came down from heaven, and was incarnate, by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary." Inseparably these two ideas are linked together. Take away one, and the other will not long remain. Take away the belief in the divine and eternal Christ, and we shall come to universalism not the Incarnation of the Lord Jesus. The time will then come, and come very soon too—as many of our modern seers and prophets are anticipating—when men will no more agree to discuss the Nature and Person of Christ, than they agree now to discuss the nature of Socrates; and in truth it will concern them very little more to do so. Inseparable as these two truths are, yet, brethren, it is that very doctrine of the Atonement, and especially of the Mediation of Jesus Christ, which is the most strenuously objected to by many amongst us at the present day, as an entirely preposterous and even a barbarous addition to the grand and simple idea of the Father of our spirits, the moment we penitently come to Him in sorrow for what we have done, forgiving our sins. They ask us men who honestly believe in this doctrine of intercession and forgiveness of sin, do men need any such mediation or intercession in order to exercise forgiveness? You need no such interposition; but you willingly, freely, forgive; and the better you are, the more freely and willingly you forgive him who has offended against you. And what should have made God less placable, less compassionate than a good man? What is this doctrine of the Atonement, and mediation which relegates God to the old religion of fire, and pictures Him as an angry and unforgiving man, only to be appeased by sacrifice, and only to be approached by intercession, and privileged mediators? Why cannot you go back to the older books of your faith? Why cannot you rise into the sublime idea of the prophet and the psalmist of old, who with their belief in Deism took their station by the altar on which the smoking victim lay, and, looking upward, cried "Sacrifices and offerings the Lord will not, the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken spirit and a contrite heart, the Lord will not despise." If you had not made a barbarous addition to this simple idea there would be no need for you, when you pray, to say "we are heard of the Father for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ." Let us honestly and boldly face this difficulty, for a difficulty it really is. Let us try to see if there is any answer, any fair and honest answer to it. And in doing this let us attempt no theological evasion of the difficulty: let us not lie for God; let us not say that we cannot argue from the analogy of human forgiveness to the divine forgiveness, because God's ways are not as our ways, and His thoughts as our thoughts. That may be true, brethren, in some respects, but it is not true as regards this. It is true when God uses the same word to describe His ways and our ways; if that be not so, then the words that He uses are not only misleading, but they are utterly unmeaning—they have no meaning whatever. They are merely arbitrary and unintelligible, and they are misleading and deceptive symbolisms. Be sure of this that if the words forgiveness, mercy, and compassion do not mean, where they are used of God, at least as much as they mean where we use them of men, they have no meaning whatever. Let us be

sure then of this, when we are told that God loves that God forgives, we are to understand just what we understand by man loves. and man forgives. Other and deeper meanings they may have, for these words are used respecting Him who knew. Let us, as I have said, deal honestly with this difficulty, and see whether, taking it for granted as we are bound to take it for granted, there is not an analogy, a close and real analogy between divine and human forgiveness. Let us see whether, assuming that and basing our whole argument upon that, we may not find better reasons for the great truth of the Atonement and the Mediation. Let us see, in one word, what is the real idea of human forgiveness, by what difficulty, if any, it is beset, and what are the laws which really govern it amongst men as we try to forgive our debtors.

In the first place, let us see what is our Lord's teaching concerning the doctrine of forgiveness of sin in the words I have read to you, "Forgive us our debts." What does our Lord there tell us of sin? In the first place He tells us it is something that needs forgiveness. That is to say, sin is not merely a disease to be healed, nor an imperfection to be remedied, but that it is an offence, and an offence that brings with it a penalty, which cleaves to the offender as a debt cleaves until it is remitted to the debtor. And then He tells us further that for this debt there is a possibility of remission—the forgiveness of sin is analagous to the remitting of a debt. That is to say, that our Lord gives us this as the popular, ordinary, human idea of forgiveness—it is the letting off to a man of the debt he owes; it is the putting of him by the creditor, as far as he can do so, in the position he would have occupied, if he had never contracted that debt. Observe, and let me carry you with me if I can, our Lord's statement is this: first of all there is guilt; secondly, penalty for that guilt; thirdly, the possibility of the remission of that debt; and fourthly, a close analogy between the remission of that debt by God to us and our remission of debt to man. See, then, where this brings us. It brings us to the question how and under what conditions is it possible for us to forgive our human debtors, those who have offended against us? Is this idea of human forgiveness such a very simple operation for man? Let us take it in its simplest form. Let us take it that an offence is committed as between two equals, who have no other relation between them than their natural humanity. Let us suppose that any one of you who are now listening to me had been so unfortunate as to have committed some wrong against a fellow man. The instant you do that the man becomes, in spite of you and himself, your creditor. You are his debtor for two great debts—the debt of penitence and the debt of reparation. You ought, every one of you, to be sorry for what you have done, and you ought to make amends; or in other words your debt is that you owe that sorrow, and you owe that reparation to him; and you owe it by virtue of a law that neither he nor you can set in motion, nor yet he or you can withstand—by the law of your own conscience. There is that within you that, when you have done wrong, claims from you at once the debt, and the penalty of repentance and restitution. There is an advocate of the man you have wronged within your own breast. There is the voice of conscience that becomes a voice ever crying to the Throne of God. It is your adversary until you have made amends, and it gives you over to the torments of your own remorse, of your own shame, that abides in your own heart and will not depart from it, until you have paid the uttermost farthing of that debt. That is the very nature of the case as it arises instantly between you and him, between your creditor and yourself the debtor. Now it is quite true the creditor may remit that penalty to you, and you hold it to be the very noblest charity if he does. He forgives you—fully, freely, unconditionally, lovingly, nobly if you will—what then? Is all the penalty remitted? Have you escaped all the punishment of your act? He has forgiven you; but have you for that reason forgiven yourself? Nay; is it not often the case that the very fulness and freeness of his forgiveness is heaping coals of fire upon your head, and that they are kindled and fanned into a flame by the very breath of his compassion? You know it is so, and in all the finer and better natures it is ever most keenly so. Already, then, we have discovered this—that there is, between equal and equal no absolute and entire remission of sins possible Behind the figure of the creditor, even of the forgiving creditor, there already begins to rise up and to project itself upon our path the shadow of law; of law which, because it is law, is pitiless, unforgiving, unchangeable, and inevitable. Even in this simplest and most rudimentary case of forgiveness, we see there is no absolute remission. Let us pass one step further—let us pass to the case of social forgiveness. Let us suppose the wrong-doing has had spectators. Suppose that you and I are spectators of some cruel martyrdom, and we hear the martyr, with his dying breath, breathing out his forgiveness and blessing on his murderers. They are fully forgiven by him. Would anyone of you feel disposed to take up that legacy of forgiveness, and to repeat the blessings you had just heard the martyr pronounce upon his tormentors? Would you not rather feel your heart stirred with the deepest and most righteous feelings of indignation calling for the execution of justice upon his murderers and tormentors? Would you not feel that the blessing of forgiveness he pronounced, though in him it were the highest expression of charity, in you were the lowest and most exquisite of moral baseness? and would you not feel you could not take rest upon your bed; would you not resolve and vow that you would never know rest and peace until you had avenged him of his cruel wrong; and that this would not be revenge, but the vindication of

righteousness? Why is it we could not forgive a wrong upon others? Just for this reason: It is his wrong and not ours; we are not merely spectators of the fault; we are, by the fact of our being there, and being members of a society to which they and we belong, judges of the crime, and we feel that we have no right to remit the penalty.

And there is another reason too. The instinct of self-preservation is strong in our hearts, as it is strong in the heart of society. Society cannot afford to suffer martyrdom; it is wrong for society to court or to submit to martyrdom. The thousand, the myriad interests that are entrusted to its guardianship, would be sacrificed if it were to allow sin with impunity. A society founded upon a true and pure benevolence, and universal forgiveness of offences, could not endure and hold together for a day. Society dare not, society cannot, and must not forgive its debtors. You see, now, we have advanced a step further; we have still the debt to be paid, for we have still the law, and the person or persons who are to enforce the law, but you observe to what small dimensions the personal element in this equation has shrunk. You see how great already looms the idea of law; you see the debtor and creditor are already becoming both together debtors to the great, inexorable, universal law that binds the creditor to punish, and binds the debtor to suffer, and in this aspect you see that human forgiveness is not such an easy thing. The criminal has little to fear from the anger of his judge who is enforcing the law, but for that very reason he has nothing to hope from his compassion, and that is the law which we are coming more and more in contact with, and less and less with personality. And now one step, and one step only, further. Let us suppose this criminal has paid the penalty for his offence; that he has paid the penalty that he can pay, and lives. He has given, in the way of reparation, all that society claims from him, but is he free from penalty? Does the society that forgives him give him back what society was compelled to take from him, it might have been years ago? Can it give him back the happy years of what proves to be a wasted life? Can it bring him back the disappointed hopes, the joys, which are soon to vanish away? Can it give him back the honour, the love, the obedience, the troops of friends that once were his? Can it compel men who shrink from his contact as they would from the touch of a leper—can it compel them to give him beside them the honoured place, as a guest at the banquet, which he might once have been entitled to? Can it cut off the consequence of his sin, that goes on and on, as that sin continues to injure others by its example, or natural consequences? And so continues echoing and re-echoing on through the ages; multiplying and replenishing the earth with its evil progeny; and the birth of every fresh sin that springs from its parentage multiplies it against the founder. Can it do this? Never. And thus you see, by the very condition of things in which we exist, we come at last to a point in which the personal element of pity, and compassion, and justice even, seem to vanish altogether, and a man is face to face with a stern, impersonal, mechanical, universal law, that is certain as death, and pitiless as the grave; and that for sin in such a constitution of things there is no possibility of remission. So, then, forgiveness is not so simple; so, then, the idea of human remission of all penalty for an offence is not the natural and easily intelligible process that it first appeared to us when we heard these words "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors."

And now let us come, in the next place, to apply these analogies as briefly as we may, to the great doctrine of divine forgiveness of sin; to the Divine Creditor and human debtor. God will forgive us, we assume, as easily as we forgive our fellow-men, and yet we have seen that the very idea of the forgiveness of a fellow-man is only possible on one condition—that we completely isolate the debtor and creditor from all other relations, and regard them alone as equals, as wrong-doer and sufferer; and yet is it not quite clear that that is the very position in which God can never stand to any one of us? If there be one thing more clear than another it is this, that by no ill deed of ours can we wrong or hurt God. Our goodness extended not unto Him, and how can our wrong-doing hurt Him? Can He be supposed to cherish against us the passion of revenge that needs to be restrained? Can He keep a debtor and creditor account with us, the creatures of His breath? It is impossible. The one condition in which we cannot stand to God is that of an equal dealing with an equal, for an offence and wrong-doing. But as regards our other relations, what is He to us? He is the ruler of all that complex system of society in which wrong produces endless debt. He is the judge of that vast multitude of humanity which He has created, every one of whom has a claim at His judgment-seat against his fellow that has wronged him. There has been no drop of blood that has ever been shed on this earth, since the blood of righteous Abel, that has not cried to the ears of the Lord God of Sabbaoth. There has been no ground of suffering, there has been no complaint of wrong, there has been no cry from wounded and agonised hearts, smarting under the wrongful dealing of fellow-men that has not echoed in the ears of our Ruler; and if the earthly judges He appoints bear not the sword in vain, how can we suppose that this eternal crying and wailing of suffering humanity for justice shall be in vain? There is this further difficulty. He is the author of that very constitution of things, of those very inexorable and unalterable laws, under which we have seen forgiveness that is scarcely conceivable. Are we to suppose, then, that He will deflect those laws, and turn them aside at our bidding? Are we to suppose that those mills of

God, which, as the ancients said, ground so slowly, and which ground so very small that nothing escaped them, at the last will be stilled at our prayer, after He has set them in motion? Are you to suppose that the great red presses of the vintage of the wrath of God, that are ever crushing out the red lees, will all be stayed because some trembling penitent asks that they may be stayed? Where is there room amidst this moral constitution of the universe, ruled by a Moral Ruler, where is there room for forgiveness of sin? Where can you find the idea of the easily-forgiving God, which at first we thought? Do you not see, dear brethren, do you not see, after all, that all this magniloquent and windy talk about a merciful and compassionate God, so facile and easy in His forgiveness, is a pure conception of modern Theism; and is, after all, the poorest and lowest conception you can form of God; that it does not rise above the low thought of the savage, which pictures Him merely as an angry and offended man? Rise but one degree above that, rise up in your thoughts to the conception of Him as the Judge of the earth, and the Author and Controller of the moral universe, and all this talk about easy, good-natured forgiveness vanishes in your nobler conception of God, as the cloud-wreath vanishes at the rising of the sun.

In the last place, let us see what there remains then as to the possibility of forgiveness. What does our reason tell us as we contemplate this state of things? Does it not tell us that unless these laws which have been described can be suspended, or turned aside by some power or other, there is no hope of forgiveness? And what do we call that power that suspends and turns aside, or deflects some natural law by the introduction of a supernatural law? We call it a miracle; and miracle is a word which modern science forbids religion to speak. But a miracle, nevertheless, is needed in order to the possibility of forgiveness: a miracle in regard to the moral laws of the universe: as real and as true a miracle as any miracle in the physical laws of the universe. Yes, dear brethren, it needs as much a moral miracle on the part of God to save the sinner from the consequences of his sin, when he transgresses the moral laws of the universe, as it would need a physical miracle to snatch him from a storm, or an earthquake. The one miracle is as much needed as the other, and the one is as easy or as difficult to imagine as the other. A miracle it does need, and thank God for the fact that revelation assures us that, to accomplish it, a miracle has been wrought. What is it that revelation tells us concerning the Atonement and Mediation but this, that this miracle is the divinest and mightiest of all miracles; that the God who has framed this natural and inexorable constitution of moral law has entered this natural world, where men sin and suffer by the operation of these terrible laws; has come down and taken unto Himself that sinful and suffering humanity, and made it, in the person of His dear Son, a divine man; does it not tell us how that Son has died, and risen supernaturally to heaven, and in so doing that He has created for everyone who, dies and rises with Him by that real and mighty miracle, a new world, a supernatural world, a world in which they who enter, we are told, are no longer under the law of sin and its natural penalty, death, but are under the supernatural law of forgiveness and everlasting life? Yes, brethren, this is what revelation reveals to us. It reveals to us the miracle of a new world, even the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, into which we may flee, and be delivered from the operation of those terrible laws of justice and of punishment from which, otherwise, there is no escape. And is this then to be regarded as a barbarous addition to the idea of forgiveness? Is this thought of the mediation and atonement of Christ so much a different system of forgiveness, as is described in the story of the Prodigal Son, for instance, as it is a basis and eternal ground that makes that story, and its eternal promises, possible and true? Picture to yourselves, for one moment—if we must come back in thought to the picture of the old Hebrew Prophet that we saw early in this sermon, when I described him to you standing by his altar of sacrifice, and declaring that the sacrifice was worthless, and that God would accept the offering of his contrite heart instead—picture to yourselves for one moment that, on the heart of that prophet which glowed with love and trembling hope, there had descended some such pitiless demonstration of intellect as we have been striving to set before you; that it might clearly prove to him that, without miracle, there is no possibility of his contrite heart being accepted of God. Imagine—as this conclusion fell coldly and chillingly upon his heart, quenching all his aspirations, as some windy storm of rain may have quenched the brands upon the altar of his sacrifice—imagine that to such a heart, chilled with terror by the demonstration of his intellect, there had come the revelation that Christ has come to us Himself, and that in His Gospel there had come the assurance that the forgiveness, which his intellect so demonstrated to him could not be that without a miracle, was to be had by a miracle; that there had come this revelation of the marvel and mystery, "God so loved the world, that He sent His only begotten Son;" and that He had seen the might of Omnipotence holding assunder, as nothing but the might of Omnipotence can do, sin and its consequences; would this have been an obstacle and hindrance instead of an encouragement and joy to him to draw nearer to the Father? Then, dear brethren, there might still, there would be still, for his intellect, the question which is ever the question of the sceptical intellect, as to the how and the why of this great miracle of the Atonement; but those difficulties would not have hindered his approach, and need no more hinder your approach to the mercy-seat of the Father, than the unfathomed depths of the waters that rose right and left for the

passage of the ransomed people of God, should hinder their passage between their dark walls to the sea-shore on the other side. And, so, we gather up the lessons that this word concerning God's and man's forgiveness has brought us to contemplate: we gather them up finally thus:—To the idea of man's forgiveness, there come three different parts of man's nature,—the conscience, which tells him of a certain and just penalty for sin; the understanding, which tells him, either that there is no such thing as sin at all, or that for sin there can be no forgiveness; and the heart that cries, as the human heart will cry, "O God be merciful to me a sinner." And there is one doctrine, and one only; there is one revelation, and one only that meets, and answers—and justifies itself as it meets and answers,—these three cries from the troubled nature of man, and the conscience that speaks of p nalty. For revelation answers, "There is a penalty," and deepens the voice of sorrow by telling that the penalty is due for an offence against the Father, and the penalty must consist in the man being cast out of the supernatural kingdom of forgiveness, into the natural kingdom of penalty and vengeance. To the reason that demands a miracle, it gives a miracle, and speaks of the mightiest of miracles, the Incarnation and the Atonement. And then to tee heart, the trembling, anxious, yearning human heart, that still refuses to believe that man is a mere victim of soulless, mechanical law; and insists, in spite of demonstration, in believing that there is a compassionate heart in Him who has fashioned us after His image—to that heart it gives an answer, "You may go again to the Father, and you may be forgiven." And so we clasp our gospel to our heart, so we kneel before the divine presence of the Son of God and man, in whom we see incarnate the miraculous power of divine forgiveness and divine love, and spite of all hindrances that would bar us from our Father's presence, spite of the sword turned every way that the sceptical understanding still waves between man and his lost paradise, spite of the remorsefulness of our memory, spite of the terrible accusations and demonstrations of our conscience, we can still say—thank God, we can say—God give grace to everyone here to be able with all trust and belief of heart to say—"I will arise and go to my Father, and I will say to Him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and before Thee."

The Duke of Devonshire, as the present trustee of the will of the late Hon. Robert Boyle, has been pleased upon the recommendation of the Lord Bishop of London, to appoint the Rev. Robinson Thornton, D.D., vicar of St. John's, Notting-hill. to be Boyle Lecturer in succession to the Rev. Dr. Maclear.

We understand that the Rev. G. Venables, vicar of Great Yarmouth, has declined the living of Whitechapel.

The Rev. F. Brown, vicar of Barnardcastle, has been appointed to an honorary canonry at Durham.

The Rev. W. Harker, vicar of Minton-next-Sittingbourne, has resigned his living in consequence of failing health.

THE ROCK.

By the Rev. THEOPHILUS CAMPBELL, D.D., Rector of Shankill, Diocese of Dromore; and Chaplain to His Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

Sermon Preached before the University of Dublin.

"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—St. Matt. xvi. 18.

It is scarcely necessary for me to remark that round this saying of our Lord has raged for centuries one of the fiercest theological controversies that has ever disturbed the peace of the Church. The Church of Rome has made it the basis of her arrogant pretensions to supremacy, while all Protestant Churches have vigorously laboured to disprove the justness of her interpretation of the passage. It is much to be regretted that it has been thus made the subject of controversy, as thereby the deep and precious truth conveyed in it has been to a considerable extent kept out of view, and an interpretation favoured, at least of part of it, which appears to me to be altogether foreign to our Lord's intention, and to be at variance both with Scripture teaching and with observable fact.

Our Lord, with the purpose of presenting an important revelation of Himself to the disciples, proposed to them the question, "Whom say ye that I (the Son of Man) am?" To which Peter replied, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, the living God." The emphatic words of the answer being the two last—τοῦ ζῶντος—the living One, *i.e.*, the living God.

We must take this declaration as the words, the *ipsissima verba*, of God Himself. It must not be lowered down to a mere statement of the speaker's opinion, or that of his fellow Apostles, in opposition to the various opinions entertained of Him by others, that He was John, or Elias, or Jeremias, or one of the Prophets. It is not, we say, or we think Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God; but "Thou art." The utterance came forth in its perfection, as the assertion of a fact, unknown previously by Peter, untaught to him by any human Being, not arrived at by any process of human thought, but being a special revelation by God Himself, made then and there, in order to perfect our Lord's design in proposing the question, and to present to the faith of the Church in all ages the great truth wrapped up in the words, and which He was about to complement by the further revelation from His own lips which followed.

It will, I think, be readily admitted that Peter did not comprehend the full import at least of the words he spoke, nor until "the Spirit of Truth" had come to guide into the whole truth. This seems to me to be involved in the response of our Lord, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath

not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven."

At a later period St. Paul claimed a special revelation to himself of that Gospel which he preached, untaught to him by any man, even as to the facts of our Lord's history, as appears from his Epistle to the Galatians, and in declaring which he assured the Corinthians that he spake them "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." (1 Cor. ii. 12-13.) Similarly, I apprehend, did Peter utter the words now before us.

I have said that the emphatic words in the Apostle's declaration are "τοῦ ζῶντος"—the living One. The life here contemplated demands a somewhat lengthened consideration. Life has ordinarily two distinct applications, either as life-time, the duration of existence; or, as essential Being—the principle of living. We say, "the life is in him," or, "the life has left him." We say of a stone, "it has no life," though the stone may have an eternal existence. In this latter sense it is used here, and as such is identical with mortality. Immortality is frequently, and most unphilosophically, confounded with endless duration, or existence, as if they were identical; whereas immortality is an innate and essential principle of the life of which I am speaking: a life which cannot cease to be, which cannot die, which cannot corrupt, which cannot be dissolved, which exists *ex necessitate naturæ*. Hence, writing to Timothy, St. Paul asserts of God, "Who only hath immortality." Justin Martyr, as quoted by Alford, says, "He only who has immortality is called God, because He possesses life not from the will of another, even as all others who are immortal, but from His own being." God has innate essential life, and He only hath this. Accordingly our Lord thus speaks, "as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself." (John v. 26.) ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ. This ζωὴ ἐν ἑαυτῷ is innate, essential life, *i.e.* ,immortality. This gift of "life in Himself," to the Son is, as all gifts to Him must be, (for in His Deity He possesses all things without gift) as manifested in the flesh, the Son of Man, the Christ; and all gifts to Him as such are gifts for His Church, with which as His body, He, the Head, shares them; the life of the Head must be the life of the Body. Hence, subsequently, He reveals the channel through which this great gift of life, or, immortality, is conferred on men. It is never conferred on angels. Though they, we believe, shall live, exist, endure, whatever word we use, for ever, yet will they not possess life in themselves, they will exist by the will of their Creator. "God only hath immortality."

In that wonderful discourse recorded by St. John in his Gospel, in which more than in any other, our Lord treats of this life as conferred on men, He says "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you"—ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς—life in yourselves—"whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." He had previously expressed the same deep truth thus, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven, if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." Here both negatively and affirmatively He declares that the eating His flesh and drinking His blood is the way, the only way it must then be, whereby this gift of eternal life, life in oneself, is conferred on man—"except ye eat . . and drink ye have no life—He that eateth . . . and drinketh hath life."

Let me digress for a moment; what is this way whereby, and whereby alone, eternal life is conferred on man? In other words, what is it to eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of Man? Of this I am confident that one entirely ignorant of the controversial use that has been made of this passage, reading it for the first time, would naturally identify the eating and drinking with that faith of which our Lord speaks in the words "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." (Verse 47). And which He Himself immediately after identifies with the eating of Him as the Bread of Life; thus, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." (Verse 51). The whole teaching of our Lord may be thus expressed, *Through faith in the Son of Man as the crucified one eternal life is bestowed on man.* What bearing, then, has this declaration on the Sacramental System? Is it not utterly to overthrow it? That System formulates itself thus—Baptism confers life, and the Eucharist sustains the life thus conferred. Has anyone ever ventured to interpret the words "eat my flesh and drink my blood" of Baptism? Surely no one will make the venture, and yet this eating and this drinking is, as we have seen, the only means whereby life is conferred. Baptism, therefore, cannot be the mean. And since the Eucharist does not confer, but only sustains the life previously given, these words of our Lord can have no reference to that Sacrament.

But to return to our subject. The special revelation to Peter supplies the answer to the question, Who is the Rock on which the Church is built? and is, "Christ the Son of the living God," and this, because He is the Son of *the living* God, of God the living One, possessing the life of God, essential life, "life in Himself," and through faith in Whom this same life is communicated to men. No doubt led by this, this Apostle wrote, "To whom coming as unto a living stone, ye also as living stones are built up a spiritual house;" (1 Epis. ii. 4—5) the foundation on which the structure rests, and every stone thereof, instinct with life, which binds the whole as one—"that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us." (John xvii. 21.)

In the exposition of the text what appears to me to be a very serious error is constantly made, even that our Lord is speaking of the foundation of the

Church. This may at first seem strange, but a little consideration will, I hope, establish my position. Two things totally distinct are in architecture called the foundation. One is the foundation of the building, the first layer of stones. This is the foundation of the building itself, a part of the structure. The other is the substratum on which the foundation is laid; the foundation under the foundation, and which constitues no part of the building. Builders speak of having got a good foundation, be it solid clay, or rock, on which to build; or of being unable to build in a certain place because they can obtain no solid foundation. It is but a trite observation to say our Lord ever spake with the strictest accuracy. At the close of the Sermon on the Mount He marks this distinction. He compares the man who hears His sayings, and does them, to "a wise man who built his house upon a rock, and . . . it fell not, because it was founded (the foundation was laid) upon a rock" (Matt. vii. 24-25). In St. Luke, of the unwise man He says, "that without a foundation he built his house upon the earth" (Luke vi. 49). But whether laid on rock or sand every house has a foundation of its own, apart from that under-foundation on which it is laid, and on whose character depends the stability of the house. And so the Church of Christ. It has a foundation of its own, "the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets" (Ephes. ii. 20). And there is also an under-foundation, which supports the entire spiritual building, from the foundation to the top stone, the Rock of our text, Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. The Church is thus "*fundata in fundamentum.*"

We must not pass over the words, "Thou art Peter," without remark. How frequently it is said, even by Protestants, that from these words it is evident, that, in some sense, Peter must be the Rock. According to this assumption, the meaning assigned to πέτρος is "a rock." Whereas its true interpretation is "a stone," the detached portion of a rock, moveable, unsteady, most unsuitable for a foundation. To say nothing of the Greek scholar, no mere English reader should ever have made this mistake, for we are expressly instructed by St. John (i. 43), that this name, given by our Lord to St. Peter meant a stone. The passage is, "Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, a stone," Cephas being the Aramaic form of the name. Here, as an instance of the confusion existing in the minds of some modern Commentators, let me specify Alford, who translates stone as the equivalent for Peter, while in his remarks on our text he confounds Rock and Stone, asserting that πέτρος = κηφᾶς signifies a Rock, and further asserts, based on this mistranslation, for Peter a superiority as "the first of those foundation stones on which the living temple of God was built," quoting Ephes. ii. 20. This passage certainly does not assign any superiority to one Apostle, or Prophet, over the others. Moreover it is not of the foundation proper of the Church, as I have already shewn, our Lord is speaking in the text, but of that under foundation on which the foundation of the Church is laid.

Far, then, from this name "denoting the personal position of this Apostle in the building of the Church of Christ," it appears to me on the contrary as calculated, and so intended, to humble him. By the marked contrast which our Lord draws between πέτρος and πέτρα. He seems to me to indicate this as His design, under the special revelation that had been vouchsafed to Him. As He gave to St. Paul "a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet him, lest he should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations;" so to Peter the Lord said, as it were, "thou art a stone, unsteady, moveable, therefore on thee I could not build my Church, but on this rock, fixed, immoveable, as revealed to thee, even myself, the Christ, the Son of the living God, will I build my Church." As St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (1 Epis. iii. 11.)

We are now prepared to consider the promise, "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." That a close connexion exists between this promise and the previous statement must strike every attentive reader, "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," that is, because built upon this rock. We have some misconceptions to clear away before we proceed, misconceptions arising from the use of the word "Hell" in the authorised version, where it is employed to represent both Gehenna and Hades, the former the *place* of final punishment, "the lake of fire and brimstone," the "everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels," and of which the Lord spoke when He said, "fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." The latter is the *state* of departed souls between death and the resurrection, as in the prophecy, "thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell." Under the misconception that the gates of Hell "mean the gates of Gehenna," the promise before us is interpreted to be that the power of the Devil shall not prevail to destroy the Church. Here is something very strange indeed. It pre-supposes that the Devil is lord of Gehenna, the criminal, lord of his prison house!

Now, "there is no power but of God," and the prison house of Gehenna can represent only the power of His "justice," as the Law-giver. But the Devil has a power, "the power of death," (Hebrews ii. 14), and this he exercises to the destruction of the Church from age to age, and it is given to him to prevail against the Church, "to wear out the people of the saints of the Most High;" so that both Scripture and fact negative the view of the promise so generally entertained. But though cut off by death, is the Church therefore destroyed—gone for ever? Here in answer comes the promise of the text, "The gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." "The

gates of Hades" is the power of the unseen state of the soul after death. When severed from the body on death, the soul passes into the state of Hades, within its gates confined until the Resurrection, when, those gates opened by Him who is "the Resurrection and the Life," the soul shall return from its unseen and se arated state, and reunited to the body restored from the state of death, shall come back through the opened gates, the resurrection thus accomplished. The promise is, consequently, a promise of the Church's resurrection.

Thus St. Paul writes in 1 Cor. xv., "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory: O death, where is thy sting? O Hades, where is thy victory?" The victory of Hades, obtained through death, shall then be at an end, the gates opened, "the power thereof destroyed," the souls of the redeemed bursting from Hades and the bodies from death, the whole Church rising into life, the song of victory shall peal through the echoing skies, "Hades, where is thy victory?"

In connection with this subject two most important passages occur in the Book of the Revelation, where our Lord in vision presented Himself to the Apostle. (Chap. i.) He said, "I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen, and have the keys of Hades and of Death:" the keys to open the gates and let the imprisoned free, and in fulfilment, too, of the promise of our text. In the 21st chapter we are told, the winding up of the world's history in its present state, "Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire," (verse 14): death, the state of the body, Hades, the state of the soul during their separation, but at last both cast into Gehenna, the metaphor implying the utter destruction, and for ever, of the last enemy.

One more point remains to be briefly considered. The necessary connection between the promise, and the foundation on which the Church rests. I have already plainly intimated that this connection exists in the immortal life of Him who is the foundation, which life is imparted to everyone who is a stone in the building. Our Lord declares Himself to be "the resurrection and the life," connecting these as one. The life that was His, even while in mortal flesh, because conceived by the Holy Ghost, "the Lord, and the giver of life," energizing within that flesh as it lay in the tomb, raised Him up from death because "it was not possible that He should be holden of it." He rose in the power of that life, "the first *born* from—the first *begotten* of—the dead." (Col. i., 18.; Rev. i. 5). "As it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee." (Acts xiii., 33). As this risen One, the first immortal Man, is He the foundation, a living, not a dead foundation. It is His risen life that by the birth of the Spirit is communicated to the Church, "according to the working of His mighty power which he wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead." (Eph. i., 19, 20). It is this life of which St. Peter speaks, when he describes the members of the Church, as "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever." (1 Epistle i. 23.) The soul thus instinct with life, this immortal life, incorruptible, indissoluble, this ζωὴ ἐν ἑαυτῷ, dies not on death, but imprisoned within the gates of Hades, waits until He who, as the Head, first burst from their portals, shall apply the key, unlock the gates, and set His members free; who then rising, "the Church of the firstborn," the immortal Body of the immortal Head, the living stones of the spiritual building erected on Him, the living Rock, shall raise their shout of triumph over death and Hades, to which in fulfilment of the promise of the text, they shall then bid a long and lasting farewell.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1880.

WE direct attention to the Bishop of Peterborough's eloquent and logical sermon in another column, because we hold that his splendid vindication of Law and his reasonable explanation of the Atonement are especially needed at the present day. The former as "the Schoolmaster to bring us to Christ" is always needed by the individual; but *now* we fear it is being too much disregarded both at home and abroad by the Government if not by Society. Never surely at any time was an explanation of the Atonement more loudly called for, and we believe that Dr. Magee's will prove reasonable and convincing to most minds.

THE SITUATION IN IRELAND.

THE Irish difficulty is one of the burning questions of the hour, with which Her Majesty's Government have to deal. To persons living in other countries the present state of Ireland seems

simply terrible. The press teems with accounts of the drafting of additional police and troops to disturbed districts; with inflammatory speeches of Mr. Parnell and the members of the Land League; with particulars of crime and outrage, culminating in murder committed by the peasantry. It is a melancholy record; but in reading it we should bear in mind the excessive publicity attendant upon evil-doing as compared with well-doing. One sinner destroyeth much good: one ill-disposed, ill-conducted person may give a bad name to a whole neighbourhood. This should be borne in mind; but, admitting it, who could form a perfectly true estimate of the present state of Irish feeling? There can be no doubt that the safety-valve, as it is called, of public meetings has been grossly abused. The Government may have wished to try the experiment of excessive patience and long-suffering; but it has resulted in very serious evils. Irishmen are naturally excitable, and when to their national temperament is applied the stimulus of a crowded meeting and violent speeches, in which, *e.g.*, the Irish Secretary is described as "Buck-shot Forster," and they are told by Mr. Parnell that a certain American gave him so many dollars to be spent in Ireland—a portion in bread, and the balance in lead, it is not to be wondered at that so ready-witted a people act upon hints, which can hardly be regarded in any other light than either as incentives to individual murder, or resistance of the constituted authorities. This sort of thing goes on for months unchecked, the Government make no sign, agitation consequently becomes more and more of a trade, and a roaring business is done. The Irish Land Question is far too large and difficult a problem to be dealt with in a single article or series of articles. The national attachment to land is a sort of earth-hunger; there is often such competition for vacant farms that the good-will of them brings almost what would purchase the fee-simple. Men impoverish themselves by investments of this kind, are unable ever afterwards to extricate themselves from difficulties; consequently they lead miserable, struggling lives, with the wolf always at the door. Such men readily listen to any proposals that profess to turn them into proprietors by the aid of the Government, however insane and visionary they may be. As regards Agrarian crime, which is such a sad stain to Ireland, can any explanation of it be given? In Ireland a murder arising out of domestic jealousy or for the purpose of accomplishing a robbery is often spoken of as an English murder, *i.e.*, an English type of murder. Agrarian murder is the Irish type. Agitators endeavour to palliate it by saying that the landlords commit murder according to due process of law; for they turn the people out to starve and die on the roads. And they add, is it to be wondered at that a man smarting under a sense of such wrong should attempt to take the life of him who inflicted it? But the deliberate nature of Agrarian murders in Ireland is one of their most terrible features; they are not committed merely in hot blood on the spur of the moment, and it is also believed and indeed known to be the case, that they are committed by hired assassins who are paid for "the job." The writer knows a case where an assassin of this class was caught red-handed and expiated his crime on the gallows. Such men are often brought from considerable distances, and when "the job" is done they disappear. The difficulty of detecting criminals in Ireland is notorious. It partly arises from the utter want of sympathy of the mass of the people with English or Imperial rule, England is so hated and detested; partly from a feeling general in Ireland that an informer is a peculiarly objectionable person; partly from fear that any assistance given towards detecting crime would be punished by perhaps a band of midnight visitants with blackened faces, firing hayricks and houghing cattle. Still poor old Ireland is by no means on the whole an unsafe or unpleasant place of residence. If the people were not kept in a state of chronic agitation by professional agitators they would for the most part be most peaceable and well-disposed. There is a charm about the Irish character that is very attractive; and it only needs that strangers should be better acquainted with the country, in order to form a more favourable estimate of it.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS: HOW IT MAY BE STRENGTHENED AND MANIFESTED.

By the Rev. J. LLEWELYN DAVIES, M.A.

The word saints is apt to lead our thoughts up to the invisible world. We think more easily of saints as peopling the courts of heaven than as sinning and struggling here below. And it has been not uncommon to interpret the phrase, the Communion of Saints, as meaning that we of the Church militant here are united in mystical bonds with the Church triumphant above. But in the form in which the subject has been presented to us for discussion the phrase will no doubt suggest, as it ought to do, the ideal fellowship that may be partially realised amongst saints still clothed with mortal flesh and blood.

"We took sweet counsel together, and walked in the house of God as friends." These touching words, of one who was grieving over a violated friendship, will occur to many as they dwell in thought on the Communion of Saints. Our subject might raise before the mind an image of devout persons holding converse, in the confidence of familiar friendship, on the things of God and of the soul. Who can be called saints, except those who withdraw from earthly interests and turmoil that they may give themselves to holy meditations and religious employments? And when such persons meet, on what subjects will they commune together, except those on which the minds and hopes of saints will naturally be set? Communion, however, does not stand for communing, nor are we to understand by saints those only whom we should characterise as saintly persons. The New Testament word "saints" is equivalent to Christians, and by communion is meant the common interest, the sharing of possessions and hopes, the unity as of brethren and fellow-citizens, to which all

Christians are called. How the partnership of Christians may be made more manifest and practical is the question before us.

In the Apostles' Creed, the Communion of Saints follows the Holy Catholic Church, and the Holy Catholic Church follows the Holy Ghost. There is more in this sequence than casual juxtaposition. Turning back to our origins, we find these three articles livingly illustrated. What we believe is that which has shewn itself in historical reality. On the Day of Pentecost the Holy Ghost came down and breathed the Holy Catholic Church into existence. No sooner was this body born into its new life than the members of it, the saints, began to manifest their fellowship. The communion or partnership of the saints took the outward form thus described: "All that believed were together, and had all things common;" "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common." That was the primitive communio of the saints, manifested in a form which could not be permanent, but which was intended to stand on record for ever as a speaking symbol of the true consciousness of the Church. The power of the common calling, the common relation to the One Lord, induced a crowd of persons who had previously been strangers to each other to begin at once, in the simplest and most practical manner, the life of a family.

The point that I would urge is this, that we shall be doing what is most Scriptural and Catholic if we look away from the features in which we are like and the features in which we are unlike, from our agreements and our differences, to those principles in the nature and action of God which bind us as saints or Christians together. We have not to create a unity out of the most concordant elements we can bring together; we have not to form a brotherhood of those who are in complete sympathy with each other. We can leave it to the One Lord, the One Father, the One Spirit, to draw us Their worshippers into such fellowship with each other as They please. If we are true to our calling and to Him Who has called us, our loyalty to God will constrain us to regard our brothers with reverence and with natural family affection. It has been said, indeed, that we shall have more heart to give to our fellow-men whom we can see if we do not waste our worship on a God Whom we cannot see; but every Christian knows what an utter misconception that is. In order to love fellow-men who do not attract or please us, in order to make their interests ours, we need that self-surrendering love of Christ and of God, that love mixed with awe and sustained by a sense of duty, which embraces every man made in the image of God and claimed by Christ as a brother.

The partnership which depends on our common relation to the one Lord, the One Father, and the One Spirit is itself undiscriminating. If it compelled us, in our personal life, to put no difference between one brother and another in respect of friendship and confidential converse, we should instinctively rebel against it or neglect it as unreal. But it imposes no such duty upon us. The Divine Lover of Mankind allowed Himself to form companionships of different degrees with those whom He came to draw to Himself and to His Father. There were twelve of whom He said, "I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of My Father I have made known unto you." Of those twelve we find three—Peter and James and John—chosen for special companionship; and of these three one is distinguished as the disciple whom Jesus loved. Outside of this company also the Lord had his preferences. "Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus." Similar discriminations are permitted to us, His followers; nay, life itself, with Divine authority, compels us to cherish fellowships of varying degrees and kinds. All the infinite and beautiful variety of characters and circumstances is not to be wasted upon us. The exquisite enjoyments of a converse in which the deepest hopes and solicitudes may be interchanged are to be honoured as amongst God's most precious gifts. The healing of wounds, the ministration of courage, the confirming of convictions, which come of the sweet counsel-taking of familiar friends, are seals which God Himself sets upon human friendship. The special intimacies to which we are invited by feeling, by agreement, and by circumstances, lie within the great bond of the communion of the saints in Christ. "*Omnes omnium caritates ecclesia una complexa est.*" And whilst they are not inconsistent with that bond, they are not unaffected by it. Intimate friendship, like conjugal affection, will have the more of strength and permanence and grace for being nourished at its roots by awe and reverence, instead of being entirely dependent upon mutual liking and the help the one friend may get from the other. The association of those who share the same ways of thinking and the same tastes in religion, so natural and yet so apt to be infected by the vices of a heated sectarianism, will be purified by the reverent habit of finding the deepest bond of union not in the agreement of opinions, but in the common redemption and common hopes of Christians. To approve the same things and to condemn the same things has the great advantage of making fellow-work practicable, and so of promoting the sympathies which fellow-work generates, and there is no blame to us if we let such agreement bring us together and set us working for the same objects; but it will make an important difference to us to remember that God creates and fosters a mystical unity between saints who are not—as well as between saints who are—of the same school or party.

But is there not a duty of separating ourselves from those of whom we do not think well? God, it seems, makes us all one, and charges us, as we honour Him, to keep that unity; and yet we are warned by high authority to have as little as possible to do with a large number of our fellow-Christians. We are to give up the companionship of those who are likely to do us spiritual harm; we are not to keep company—no, not to eat—with a brother whose moral conduct causes scandal; if any one brings not a certain doctrine, we are not to receive him into our house or bid him God-speed. Under the sense of this duty solemn protests have been made, I believe, against the confusion said to be wrought by these congresses, which bring together on the same platform of Christianity and Churchmanship clergymen who differ seriously on points of doctrine and ritual. What will the people think, it is asked, when they see an Evangelical clergyman owning a Ritualist as his brother in the Communion of Saints? Must they not suspect his pastoral warnings of having been insincere and formal? That there is such duty we must all reluctantly admit. To put it wisely in practice is the work of Christian prudence and tact. If our subject of this morning could have been divided into parts, it might have been allotted to one speaker to dwell on the application of the Christian duty of separation to modern needs and circumstances. For we may be talking about communion idly and to no purpose, if

all that we say is liable to be stultified by an opposite principle of separation, which asks—"What communion hath light with darkness?" What I would urge, if I had time, would be to the following effect—that prudential considerations can have no force against the law of union and communion; that the directions which prudence may give are variable, having relation to times, places, and persons; and that it is of capital importance to connect the use of the expedient of separation with the sovereign law of communion. The separation, let it be noted, may be seen to be actually in the interest of the true communion, and therefore may be regarded as prescribed and sustained by it rather than as conflicting with it: and those who feel bound, for the sake of the higher life of the body, to dissociate themselves from a brother, ought to remind themselves whilst they do so, that he is a brother with whom God bids them be at one. A Christian ought to hesitate before even seeming to say, "I am holier than thou." If he is honestly persuaded that what he owes to the spiritual fellowship of all men obliges him to refrain from some outward acquiescence which might injure that fellowship, let him act as he thinks right; but let him feel that then, more than at other times, he needs to cherish humility and considerateness and goodwill.

If it be admitted, as I think it will be, that by saints we are to understand not saintly persons, but all who share the sanctity of the Christian calling, it is clear that we are under these obligations of fellowship towards all members of our own Church. So far, at least, we must go, in the recognition of Christian brotherhood. But must we stop there? Can we regard none but those who belong to the English Church as bound to us in the communion of the saints? We should none of us consent to our unity being thus circumscribed. Probably there are few of us who would not feel more at one, spiritually, with some persons outside the Church of England than with many members of it. Where then are we to draw the line? What is to be the enclosure within which Christian partnership is a duty? If we determine that to all rightly baptised persons, and to them only, the rights of fellowship are to be conceded, it is certain that this, also, will prove itself to be a merely formal rule, by which our Christian sense of duty and our Christian sympathies will refuse to be bound. If we ask, "Who is my neighbour?" the answer, "Every baptised person—no one who has not been baptised," will not satisfy us. Nothing will satisfy us but to push all barriers aside, to throw down every wall of partition, and to say without reserve—"Every fellow-man, whatever his religion, whatever his character, shall be my brother in Christ." Yes, in Christ. We do no dishonour to the one Head and the one Body by such comprehensiveness. On the contrary, we rob Christ and the Father of their due honour if we resolve to treat every man as a brother on the ground of our common humanity, but with the proviso that there shall be no Divine relationship to sanctify the fraternal bond. To keep Christ for an ecclesiastical community is to lower His place as the universal Lord and Saviour. It is true that the communion of the saints cannot mean, by definition, the brotherhood of all men; but it may involve it. The facts on which the partnership of fellow-Christians rests are to large to permit any separation of interests between man and man. It is the glory of Christ to be the veiled Lord of those who do not acknowledge Him, the Redeemer Whom they are feeling after. It should be the pride of the Christian and of the Churchman to see in the Christ Whom he adores a Head Who constrains him to be the brother of the unbaptised and the reprobate. Any arrogant exclusiveness, any refusal of human or social rights to non-Christians, any public injustice towards non-Christian races, ought to be felt by Christians as an outrage done to Christ, an insult offered to the Father in heaven. It is sometimes assumed that to give breadth you must give up depth; that you cannot have both extension and intensity; that there will be no warmth of devotion and attachment but where there is narrowness. The notion is refuted by many examples, rising up to that of a Paul, to the example which Paul followed. To be drawn with power to Christ is to have a fountain of the true enthusiasm of humanity opened in the heart. If the free spirit of fellowship breathes faintly in us, let us suspect our devotion to Christ and our appreciation of His nature. Let it prick us with wholesome shame to see men, who do not believe as we do, more generous, more humane, more ardent for justice and brotherhood, than we are. According to our faith, Christians may look for fire from heaven to burn up the prejudice and bitterness of faction and to melt the ice of selfishness. To make our Churchmanship an excuse for indulging jealousy and pride, for putting bad constructions on other people's conduct, for cherishing occasions of strife, is to use our calling for opposite ends to those for which it has been given to us. The truest Churchman is he who is most loyal to Christ, most filial to the Father, most obedient to the motions of the Spirit. In that devotion will be the best safeguard of the brotherly feeling which should bind each member of the Church to his fellow-members and to all men.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TESTIMONIAL TO BISHOP RYLE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—As several of your readers have contributed to the above fund, prehaps you will kindly allow me to inform them through your columns that on the 15th ult. my co-secretary, Mr. J. D. Alcroft, placed £1,250 to the credit of the Bishop of Liverpool at Messrs. Barclay, Bevan, and Co.'s. This sum is, of course, exclusive of Mr. William Atkinson's £1,000 and a few smaller sums sent to the Bishop direct. In acknowledging the receipt of the gift, his lordship writes:—

"I beg to express my most sincere thanks to the kind friends who so generously and unexpectedly have raised the sum of £1,250 towards the expense of furnishing my residence in Liverpool. Few, perhaps, have the least idea of the expenses which the acceptance of a bishopric entails upon a clergyman—expenses so great that I believe many Bishops are crippled for life who have not large private means. The noble contribution which you announce will most materially assist me."

I had hoped to send every subscriber a detailed list of the contributions similar to that furnished to the Bishop; but I regret that a sudden break-down in health and consequent removal from England have prevented me doing so.

T. HOWARD GILL.

78, Via della Croce, Rome, October 28, 1880.

The Baroness Burdett-Coutts has sent to the Lord Mayor £100 towards the Truro Cathedral Fund.

At the Diocesan Synod held in Dublin on the 27th ultimo, a lengthened discussion arose with reference to a motion introduced by the Rev. Duncan Craig, to the effect that "the Synod before it separates feels bound to give expression to its deep feeling of concern at the present state of anarchy reigning in the south and west of Ireland, and trusts that such measures will, at once, be adopted, as will give full protection to our suffering Protestant fellow-countrymen." The Synod judiciously came to the conclusion that the word "Protestant" should be omitted. Had the resolution been passed in its original form, it would have tended to increase the feuds, unhappily existing in that country, by identifying them with differences of a religious character. It is not the fact that Roman Catholic proprietors of land are more favoured by those who engage in Agrarian riots than the Protestant owners, and there is no reason whatever for supposing that the opposition against those professing one creed, are greater than against those professing another. Later in the day, a resolution was proposed by the Rev. F. Wynne, "that the Synod expresses its conviction that it is the duty of every member of the Church of Ireland to pray to Almighty God to give our rulers wisdom and courage to deal efficiently with the duties through which they have to go." Those words appended to Dr. Craig's resolution "form," as it is happily expressed by the *Irish Times*, "a welcome addition to the strength with which every true patriot desires to invest Government in order to enable them to face the difficult problems by which they are confronted." On the day following, at a meeting of the joint Synods of Dublin, Glendalough and Kildare, Dr. Craig, not satisfied as he should have been, with the passing of his resolution in the amended form before referred to, made allusions of a political character to the present condition of Ireland. "The landlords," he says, "had brought a great deal of the present trouble upon themselves. If in days now past, they had planted their lands with Protestant tenants instead of with Romanists, this confusion would not have come upon the country!" He spoke also of "The Romish doctrine of assassination," words which one of the clerical members of Synod, very justly condemned as being "most objectionable and injurious." Before the Synod adjourned, it was agreed that the Archbishop of Dublin should be requested to send a copy of the adopted resolution to his Excellency, Earl Cowper.

The *Record* understands that the Rev. Frederick E. Wigram, incumbent of Highfield, Southampton, has accepted the office of secretary to the Church Missionary Society, vacant by the death of the Rev. Henry Wright. Mr. Wigram is a brother-in-law of the late Mr. Wright, and nephew of the late Bishop Wigram, of Rochester. It is understood that he will, like his predecessors, Henry Venn and Henry Wright, be an honorary secretary.

The churchyard of St. Botolph Without, Aldergate-street, which for quite a generation has been closed to the public and which is about an acre in size, has been laid out in flower-beds, grass-plats, and gravel paths, with an ornamental fountain in the centre; and on Thursday was opened as a recreation ground by Alderman Staples, the Rev. S. Flood Jones, the churchwardens, the common councilmen of the ward, and many of the leading residents of the parish.

The Queen has contributed £500 towards the fund for the restoration of the abbey church of Minster-in-Sheppy, which, with one exception, is the oldest in Kent, and possesses features of deep interest to the antiquary and archæologist.

The clergy of the rural deanery of Stepney, at their meeting on Monday last, presented the Rev. Joseph Bardsley with an address and a gold watch, on his leaving Stepney for the vicarage of Bradford. Mr. Parnell, as the senior incumbent in the deanery, expressed the regret of the clergy at the retirement of the Rural Dean from East London, where amongst representatives of the various parties in the Church, he had acted in such a manner as to command the respect and the confidence of all.

The *Manchester Courier* says the rectory of St. Ann's in that city will become vacant on the 13th inst. by the resignation of Canon Bardsley, under "The Incumbents' Resignation Act, 1871," subject to a pension of about £90. The Rev. Julius Lloyd, incumbent of St. John's, Greenock, is spoken of as likely to be his successor. Mr. Lloyd was a Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1851, and was ordained deacon in 1855 by the Bishop of Rochester. He held the vicarage of High Cross, in the diocese of St. Alban's, from 1861 to 1871, and is the author of several works. The vicarage of Copp or Great Eccleston will become void on the 13th by the resignation of the Rev. William Bateson, subject to a pension of about £88. The Rev Charles Pake, London, is to be the new vicar there.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Binnie, Rev. Alfred Jonathan, curate of Kenilworth.
Brown, Rev. F., vicar of Barnardcastle; honorary canon of Durham.
Buckwell, Rev. Leighton, vicar of Newington-next-Hythe, Kent.
Burrow, Rev. Robert Foster, curate of Fordwich, Kent; rector of St. Andrew and St. Mary, Witton, Droitwich.
Cholmondeley, Rev. Francis Grenville, curate of Stoke-on-Trent; vicar of Leek Wootton.
Culme, Rev. J. J., incumbent of Woodside (Forest of Dean).
Dunne, Rev. George Thomas, vicar of St. John, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire.
Dyer, Rev. Arthur Charles, curate of Dedderhill; curate of Redmarley D'Abitôt.
Elliss, Rev. Henry Christopher, rector of Bidborough, Kent.
Flower, Rev. Walker, curate of Newington, near Hythe, and hon. secretary of the Diocesan Church Building Society; vicar of Worth.
Forbes, Rev. J. G., vicar of Hatfield Broad Oak.
Haycroft, Rev. I., incumbent of St. Chrysostom's, Peckham; chaplain of Nunhead Cemetery.
Howe, Rev. John Edmund, curate of Henley-on-Thames.
Hutton, Rev. R., vicar of St Oswald's with St. Mary, Bingfield, near Hexham.
Jardine, Rev. Charles John, vicar of Ravenfield.
Jenkins, Rev. John, perpetual curate of Llantwit Vardre.
Jenkins, Rev. Edward, vicar of St. Mary Hill, Glamorganshire.
Norris, Rev. Charles E., rector of Wendon Lofts with Elmdon; vicar of St. Edmand's, Rochdale.
Powell, Rev. F. G. Montagu, vicar of Pembroke Dock; vicar of Frocester.
Whitehead, Rev. Alfred, vicar of St. Peter's, Thanet; rural dean of Westbere.
Wigram, Rev. Frederick E., incumbent of Highfield, Southampton; honorary secretary to the Church Missionary Society.
Williams, Rev. George Hugh, vicar of Radir, Glamorgan.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cartwright, Rev. William Henry, at Havyatt Lodge, Somerset, late rector of Budcombe, and sometime vicar of Dudley, on the 29th ult., aged 81.
Hemming, Rev. George, at Little Parndon Rectory, Essex, on the 27th ult., aged 82.
Hulbert, Rev. James Lucy, B.A., died at Nice, chaplain at Carabacal, Nice, on the 1st inst., aged 40.
Parry-Hodges, Rev. T. Frederick, D.C.L., at the Vicarage-house, Lyme Regis, fellow of Winchester College, and vicar of Lyme Regis, on the 27th ult., aged 80.
Todd, Rev. Herbert, vicar of Kildinck, on the 23rd ult., aged 47.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE MARCHING ORDERS OF THE CHURCH OF GOD.

By the Rev. JAMES A. CARR, M.A., LL.D.,
Vicar of Whitechurch, Dublin.

Sermon Preached at Belgrave Church, Leicester, on Sunday Evening, Oct. 10, 1880, on behalf of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." —St. Matt. xxviii. 18—20.

THESE words put before us three leading points on which to let our thoughts dwell this evening. First, the *occasion* when the words were spoken. Secondly, the *Commission* given by them; and thirdly, the *encouragement* held out for the due discharge of that Commission.

I. The *occasion*. It was a remarkable occasion. The greatest events that had ever taken place, or shall ever take place in the history of the world, had just been consummated. Some thirty years before, in the manger of Bethlehem, the mystery of the Incarnation had been enacted: God was manifested in the flesh, the promise of the woman's seed had been fulfilled, the long promised Saviour had been born into the world; and now His death had been accomplished, and His resurrection from the dead had taken place. The great Atoning Sacrifice had been finished on the Cross, and Christ had risen again on the third day from the dead. It was a moment of triumph. The words were spoken in all the calmness of conscious victory. He who spake them was One who liveth and was dead, and is now alive for evermore. The shame and the Agony are over, the Cross and Passion, the precious Death and Burial; the glorious Resurrection has been realised, and the Ascension into heaven is about to take place! It is no longer the pale and drooping form, the Man of Sorrows, the dying Christ, such as they had seen Him but forty days before. He is no longer in the hands of His enemies—

> Thou art not conquered; beauty's ensign yet
> Is crimson in thy lips, and in thy cheeks;
> And death's pale flag is not advanced there."

He has triumphed gloriously, He has led captivity captive; and now on the wind-swept hills of Galilee, free as the air of heaven, He gives His last Commission to His Apostles. What a moment, what a place, what a gathering, what a Commission! The Son of God Himself is the centre of that little band of disciples; they surround Him with adoring awe, and listen to His last words. John is there, the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who leaned on His bosom at that Last Supper—John, to whose tender care he had bequeathed His mother as a priceless legacy; and Peter is there, who once denied Him, but will deny Him again no more; and Matthew is there, whom once His Lord called from the receipt of custom; and Thomas is there, worshipping once again his Lord and his God; and James is there, the just and upright, before long destined to be the first of the martyred Twelve; and the rest of the Eleven are there, all adoring, all waiting on the last words of their Lord and Master. Never was there such a gathering before, never shall there be the like again.

Such was the *occasion* when these words were spoken.

But in the second place let us consider the *Commission*. As these eleven representative men, these master builders of the Church of God about to be, stood together on the mountain top, the Master of them all Himself draws nigh we are told and says, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." These were the first words which fell on the ears of the disciples. They are spoken in the calm glory of the Resurrection, the thrill of conscious victory is in them. A short time before they had seen Christ in the hands of His enemies, they had seen Him helpless on the cross, they had seen Him die, they had seen Him carried to the new tomb; and now they hear Him say, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." The words are spoken on the ground of a perfected Atonement. He had finished the work which the Father had given Him to do. He had earned the universal dominion. "All power in *heaven* to win grace for men; all power on *earth* to conquer hearts. All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." Power over the angels to send them forth as ministering spirits, to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation. Power over the treasury of God's grace, to receive from thence and send down gifts for men, yea even for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them. Power over Satan's kingdom on earth to defeat his purposes, and deliver men out of his toils. Power to protect His servants in their going forth to preach His Gospel in the dark places of the earth. Power over the hearts of men to make them yield to the message, and receive into their souls the Word of Life. "*All* power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." What mighty encouragement was here to brace up the minds and hearts of the disciples for what is to follow:—"Go ye therefore," on the authority of this statement, on the ground of this fact that "all power is given unto Me, and teach all nations." Not a few here and there; not one favoured nation like the Jews, but "*all* nations;" men of every class and every clime; evangelize, make disciples of, all nations, bring them into the Church

by nations, by peoples. Do not let your minds be dwarfed by narrow insular prejudices. Do not hinder the mighty work of God in the world by narrowing down the message to an elect few. Do not omit to receive individual converts to the New Faith, until they are able to understand the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, or the Westminster Confession, or sound the mysteries of Calvinism, or reconcile grace and freewill; but go and make disciples of, christianize, *all* the nations, the great societies of peoples, the millions of earth's inhabitants, baptizing them into the name, not "the names"—we have here set forth the mystery of the Trinity, the Divine Three in One—of the "Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

It is for us to consider, brethren, whether as a Church, to whom this Commission comes, just as truly as it came to the Eleven on the hills of Galilee, we have been faithful to this our Lord's Commission; whether we have altogether and consistently acted on the tenor of these words of our Saviour, and endeavoured to carry out the work in *His way*, or allowed our own views, our own fears, our own beliefs, our own ideas to interfere with the world-wide progress of Christianity, with what was intended to be its *national* aspect; whether we have not too much sunk the *nation* in the *individual*, amd thus unnecessarily hindered and retarded the work of Christ in the world. He said, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all *nations*," bring them into the fold by baptism, and leave the results to Me. We on the other hand, I fear, have been too anxious to see the plant instead of the seed. We have watched for the great oak and overlooked the acorn, from which it should spring. We have been more jealous about the purity and accuracy and depth of the work than Christ Himself, and hence the comparative slowness of missionary progress amongst the heathen. This, I think, is a fair inference which we may draw from the tenor of Christ's words, when we compare them with what is too much the method of our modern missionary enterprize, It is worth asking, I think, whether it is not frequently the case, that too high a standard of Christian knowledge is expected from catechumens drawn from amongst the heathen.

But there is a further element in this Commission. They were not only to Christianize all nations, to receive them into the Church by baptism; they were to put clearly before them the laws which govern Christ's kingdom on earth. Doctrine and Practice must go together. "Teaching them," added our Lord, "to *observe all things* whatsoever I have commanded you." Christianity is a *life*, it is something to be *lived*, to be acted out by us, the impulse toward which is to be gained through faith and love. The new life, the life of Christ in the soul, is to be manifested *outwardly*, slowly indeed, but surely; and to this end baptized nations are to be taught to walk in the way of His commandments. "Teaching them to *observe* all things,"—the *whole round* of Christian duty and practice, without exception, for here all is valuable, all is necessary;—"whatsoever I have commanded you"—from the Sermon on the Mount, with its noble exhibition of Christian life, down to the latest ordinances committed to His Church in the Holy Eucharist—"this do in remembrance of Me," and that other Sacrament of Holy Baptism for the Remission of Sins,—all these things were to be impressed upon the minds and hearts of His followers.

III. And having given this great Commission to His Apostles, and to the Church through them, He adds the blessed assurance of His unfailing Presence to strengthen and encourage them for their work. "Lo, I myself am with you always—all the days—every day—to the end, to the completion of the age." The incarnate God would be in the midst of His Church; He would be with His Apostles, and with their successors to the end of time. What a mighty encouragement is here! what grounds for confidence, what reason for anticipating success! Can that business fail to which Christ has promised His never ceasing Presence—"Lo, *I* am with you always?" And has it not been so? In perusing the history of the Church of God, in watching the onward progress of the Christian faith, are we not made conscious of a Presence more than human? The bush has oftentimes been on fire but never consumed because God has evermore been in the midst of it. "God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved, God shall help her and that right early." But above every thing else this is a promise to the *Missionary* to strengthen and comfort him, and encourage him in his work. While it is a promise to *all*, to the whole Church of God, to every member of Christ, it is in an eminent degree a promise made to those who walk in the steps of the Apostles, and go forth to evangelise the nations of the Earth. They may claim this as a special promise made to them. "Lo I myself am with you, all the days, every day, I am with you in your days of sorrow and your days of joy, in your disappointments as in your successes, in sickness and in health; I am with you, whether labouring beneath the torrid zone, amid the fatal swamps of Africa; or in the scattered islands of the Southern Seas; or beneath the cold skies of a northern hemisphere, where the blood grows chill with perennial frost; I am with you whether contending for the truth with wily Brahmin and philosophic Buddhist, or with degraded Fingo and besotted Bechuana. I am with you always, even to the end of the world."

Such then, brethren, is the great Commission given by Christ to His Church, and such the encouragement held out for its due discharge. Every succeeding age is the inheritor of this Commission; to you and to me it comes, as it came to the Apostles. The Church of Christ is a great brotherhood, bound to disseminate its Divine principles. If we do not go to the work ourselves, we are bound to send others in our place. And this is the rela-

tion in which the *Gospel Propagation Society* stands to each one of us. It is as it were our *proxy:* it represents us in the heathen field; it does for us the work which we should each individually engage in for ourselves. The Commission was given to the Apostles, but to the Apostles as representing the entire Church: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," is a duty from which we cannot free ourselves so as to be able to say, I have nothing to do with extending the Kingdom of Christ in the world. We have everything to do with it, brethren, and if we cannot or do not go ourselves we are bound, if we desire to be loyal to Christ, to send others to do *their* work and *ours*. If we cannot or do not go ourselves, then the next best thing is to be liberal towards a great organization which is fulfilling this Divine Commission, and sending forth bands of Missionary labourers to subdue the world for Christ. And this work in which the Gospel Propagation Society is taking so noble a part is progressing, though the Church of Christ may not at any one moment of time be in a position to judge of the measure of success. "All nations" are beyond doubt being evangelized and brought within the Fold of Christ. We cannot properly judge of the work at any one moment, we can only look back and see something of what has been done hitherto, and look forward with hope and courage to the future. I met with a striking passage the other day, in an American writer, which puts forward in a very forcible way the onward progress which Christianity, with its accompanying handmaid Civilization, has been making over the world. He points to the great American Continent three or four centuries ago, covered with howling forests, and inhabited by savage pagans. "It is now being overspread (he writes) with churches, schools, and universities." At that time "Europe was wrapped in ignorance, the press was uninvented, the Turks were threatening Vienna, with a great possibility of establishing Mahommedanism as the religion of the western world. Asia was ruled by pagans or Mahommedans, and locked against all Christian missionaries, had there been life enough in Christianity to send one. Africa was an unexplored pagan blackness. And thus two or three centuries ago, the four quarters of the globe were covered with a solid midnight, save a few rays of twilight dawn in Europe. Picture as great a change for the better through our next three centuries, and say if the heavenly battle is not in progress." These words are true, brethren, they have the true ring of Christian hope and Christian courage. May they find an echo in our hearts this day, and stir us up to fresh zeal, fresh love, fresh hope, fresh endeavour, and be an impulse within us to do more, and aim higher in this great work of bringing the world to the feet of Jesus Christ.

NOTES ON THE PHARISEE.

By the Rev. C. W. JONES, M.A.,
Vicar of Pakenham, Bury St. Edmunds.

Sermon Preached at Pakenham.

"And He spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others."—St. Luke xviii. 9.

HOW familiar to all our ears is this well-known parable of the Pharisee and Publican. We meet with them both in our daily walks, we converse with them both in our daily talks; we sit with both of them at the table, we deal with both of them over the counter: nay, perhaps one of them sits in our own chair, eats off our own plate, lives inside our own coat and waistcoat, and is in fact our own self. It is, may be, the one who fulfils the last conditions, whom we are the slowest to recognise; but yet he is the one whom it is most important that we should take by the collar and arrest; whereas, to sit and pass judgment on this man as a Pharisee, and that man as a Publican, is very easy; very useless to him, and very harmful to ourselves. For God made us to be neither judge nor jury, to judge of the fact, or frame the judgment, but He has made us parties to the world-old suit of right against wrong.

Let us see then to whom it is that this parable is spoken.

"It is spoken to the Pharisees," says one. No, it is not spoken to them especially. "Is it then spoken to the Publicans?" No, not to the Publicans either. "But," it may be said, "surely it is spoken to one, or both of these classes. Why! they are even named in it."

Yes, I know they are, and that is in itself a good reason for saying that the parable was not spoken to them especially.

Was the parable of the lost sheep spoken to shepherds, or that of the great supper to people who neglected to keep their dinner-engagements, or that of the Good Samaritan to Samaritans?

Or do you think that those parables were really about sheep, and suppers, and highwaymen?

No, by no means. These were but lively ways of teaching spiritual principles by every-day earthly pictures; and they were addressed to all who needed to apply these principles in their daily life.

So it is also in this parable of the Pharisee and Publican, they are only taken as illustrations, and it is addressed, as our text distinctly tells us, to certain of the disciples of Christ who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others, and who were to take warning and example, not by all Pharisees and all Publicans, but by the conceited Pharisee and humble Publican of the parable.

"Who trusted in themselves that they were righteous." That was their feeling about themselves. They were thoroughly satisfied with their own spiritual condition. They felt in themselves an

assurance that they were saved, that they were the chosen of God.

This, then is the first note that we have to tell us who those are to whom the parable is addressed—those who possess an assurance of justification within themselves.

If anyone, therefore, feels completely satisfied with his own spiritual condition, he may be further satisfied that he is one of those to whom the parable is addressed, that he is one of those who is most likely to present the other note—that of despising others.

Now let us see how this temper—satisfaction with himself, and contempt for the rest of the world—comes out in the Pharisee's prayer, which we may as well adapt, as we go on. He speaks to this effect: "God, I thank thee that I am not like other people. I never wronged anybody of a half-penny, I never did anybody any harm, I am no adulterer, I am not like Mr. So and So, whom I see in his pew there, and what a fellow like him means by coming to a place of worship, I cannot think. I go to church, (or chapel, as the case may be,) twice in the week, I subscribe freely to charities." That is all his prayer, he asks for nothing—his sins are forgiven, (of that he is quite satisfied) and he is perfectly certain that he will never commit any more, and so he does not care to ask forgiveness for the past, or protection for the future.

Do not think that this is a kind of prayer that has passed away with the Pharisees of old, anymore than that the Publican's, "God be merciful to me a sinner," has perished with an improved system of tax-collecting. No, we have it still in various forms, as, for instance, in that familiar hymn:

> I thank the goodness, and the grace,
> Which on my birth have smiled;
> And made me in these Christian days
> A happy English child.
> I was not born, as thousands are,
> Where God was never known;
> And taught to pray a useless prayer
> To blocks of wood and stone.

And so on. This is the Pharisee's prayer all over, copied out from a penny hymn-book, which is commended by a well-known name "to the loving favour of Sunday schools, cottage meetings, and family firesides." Truly, if this is our religion, what must our irreligion be? If the light that is in us be darkness, what must our darkness be? "But," it may be said, "ought we not to thank God, for these, and other suchlike things?" Of course we ought, but we ought to thank Him with trembling. We ought to thank Him not with a feeling of triumphant superiority over those who are less fortunate than we, but with a deep sense of our own greater responsibility, with a strong feeling that we are much more answerable for what we *are*, and what we *do*, than those are, who have not our advantages. But is this generally the case? When a child is taught that hymn from which I have quoted, what is the first thought, what is the last impression, connected with it?

Is it not contempt for the miserable creatures who are brought up to worship idols? and, if this contempt does cross the border which divides it from pity, does not the pity retain a flavour of contempt, and is it not mixed with the feeling that those poor little wretches are quite out of God's ken and care, unless for the purpose of being cast into hell?

My friends, I fear that this is very much the case; I fear that we do not recognise the facts that God is the King of all the earth, and that those miserable, benighted heathen are our brethren, are God's children, as well as we are, and so we hug ourselves in our fancied superiority, forgetting that for all these things God will bring us into judgment. Our hopes, our possibilities are indeed greater, far greater than theirs: but at the same time our possibilities of falling are greater than theirs; for, the higher we are raised, the deeper a fall will be. And he who sins against light and knowledge, he who closes his eyes to the one, and his understanding to the other, will be condemned with a far severer condemnation, than will the heathen who have been shut out from both. It may then be said, if the case be so with the heathen, it were better to leave them in their darkness; it were better if we were in the night of heathendom ourselves.

What! does anyone think it would be happiness to lose God's best gifts, because they bring responsibility, because they are attended with labour? Does anyone think it would be easier to be a virtuous heathen, than to be a virtuous Christian? Does anyone think it must be easier for a heathen to live up to the light he has, than it is for a Christian to live by the light of the Gospel? No, by no means. Rather, it is more likely that it should be the other way, and that it should be harder for the heathen to obey the confused orders of a half-understood conscience, than it is for a Christian to obey a conscience, which (he has been taught) is informed by the Spirit of God, which has a Christ to which to be conformed; so that if we see a conscientious and virtuous heathen we may well think that he has had a harder struggle to follow the leading of God's spirit, than we should have. At any rate we must not despise him. And, if we may not despise him, still less may we despise those who are united with us in the closer bonds of common religion, as the Publican was with the Pharisee. Nay, so far from despising him, we must remember that we have no right even to separate ourselves from him in sentiment. For we form one family, and the faults and follies, the sins and crimes of one member, are a disgrace to all the rest.

And after all, what have we to boast of? Should we dare to pray the converse of the Pharisee's prayer, and instead of saying, "God, I thank Thee that I am not like the rest of the world," to say, "God, I wish that the rest of the world was like me, I have such trust within myself that I am righteous." I know that St. Paul once said to his judges and accusers, "I would to God that not only

thou, but also all that hear me this day were, whether with little or with much trouble, made such as I am," but even he, even the great St. Paul himself, makes an exception,—"except these bonds." And who is there among us that will dare to compare himself with St. Paul? And those bonds—they mean a great deal more than the discomfort and disgrace which belong to them; they testified to fightings without, and fears within, to untold mental and spiritual struggles, and depressions, and distresses, from which he might well wish that his hearers might be spared. Ah no, none that knows what he is himself, would dare to wish that the rest of the world was like him.

Let us then, my friends, take to heart the lesson of this parable, which Jesus spoke to those who trusted concerning themselves that they were righteous, and despised the rest. Are we among those who are perfectly satisfied with their own spiritual condition?

Then let us learn from this, that we ought to be profoundly dissatisfied with it. Let us learn that we must not dare to separate our case from that of the despised Publican; that perhaps after all he may be in reality nearer to God than we are, when our respective circumstances, opportunities, advantages, and constitutions are taken into consideration.

And let us learn, whether we be the respected Pharisee, or the despised Publican, that we can but approach the pure and holy God with downcast eyes, and smitten breast in the Publican's spirit, which prompted the words of his prayer, "God be merciful to me a sinner." And then, as we say in one of our collects, "He who declares His almighty power most chiefly in showing mercy and pity, will mercifully grant us such a measure of His grace, that we, running the way of His commandments, may obtain His gracious promises, and be made partakers of His heavenly treasure: and this through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost be ascribed all honour, and glory, praise, might, majesty, and dominion now, henceforth and for evermore, Amen."

Bishop Ryan, vicar of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, has received from his late parishioners at Bradford a cheque for £510 as a token of their "affectionate esteem."

The Bishop of Durham has received promises of £700 towards the Newcastle Bishopric Fund—namely £500 from Mr. John Hall, of Bywell Castle; £100 from Archdeacon Prest, and £100 from Archdeacon Watkins. The *minimum* sum still required to complete the endowment thus reduced to about £24,000.

The *Daily Chronicle* says that liberal subscriptions are flowing in for the building of the memorial church to the late vicar of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, one lady alone having given £400. The first incumbent is to be the Rev. A. S. Bennett, eldest son of the late vicar, and the future patronage is to be offered to the Keble College advowson trustees. The general committee comprises the names of the Earl of Glasgow, Lord Coleridge, Lord Ashley, Lord Henry Scott, Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P., Mr. J. G. Hubbard, M.P., the Dean of St. Paul's, Canon Liddon, Canon Gregory, and other influential persons.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY NOVEMBER 13, 1880.

ON THE PRESENT CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

By the Rev. E. MEADE, M.A., Canon of Salisbury.

In a paper published in the *Ecclesiastical Review* some two years ago, (see Vol. V., pp. 217, 244), it was attempted to draw attention to the state of the Church, and to the chief sources of her dangers, *internally* considered, the symptoms of decay in her Constitution, the plague-spots on her own Body, and the forecast was then hazarded that, if these evils were not corrected by some timely and efficient remedy, the blessing of the great Head of the Church could not much longer be calculated upon, without presumption;—or rather, that the forbearance, so long and so mercifully extended towards this Branch of the Catholic Church, would have reached its limit, and that, in some conspicuous manner, the "Candlestick would be removed."

And *now*, by a sure advance, and with an accelerated rate of progression, *perils from without* are closing us in; and it is much to be noticed, as an aggravation of our danger, that in presence of these perils, there is no unity of purpose, or of action, in those who should encounter them; and that, within the borders of the Church itself, there are many who regard the aggressive movements already made, and those by which she is threatened, with indifference; and an increasing number who rather welcome than fear them, while others are looking on, as bewildered mariners, without any pilot of competent skill to guide their vessel, may view the progress of a threatening storm.

It may be worth while to survey, once and again, the perils of our Church, *before* they have reached their climax,—to contemplate the rising flood *before* it has become a sweeping deluge, if, peradventure, some Nehemiah may be raised up to repair the shattered walls, and to replace the broken gates. It is almost needless to say that these remarks have no application to the inner circle, or Spiritual Church of Christ. The Church of the First-born, written in Heaven, and whose names are in "the Lamb's Book of Life," are like the family of Noah, shut safely within the ark, and the Church, in *this* sense, will certainly rise above the highest flood, and outride the fiercest storm. All the question is about the Church amongst us, *in its visible form and constitution*, and in respect of which there is no promise which ensures its safety or its integrity,

Upon the Church, so understood, there is a two-fold aggression: first, that by which the Charter of her privileges is assailed; another, by which her distinctive character is threatened. Of the former kind of aggression, the success is sufficiently apparent in the admission by recent legislation, of a claim upon the Church founded on the principle that it is the *Church of the Nation*. If the Church, because it is the Church of England, is the Church of *the Nation*, in the sense that all who constitute the Nation have a right to use it, unfettered by any condition, and without any qualification, save this one, that they are English; then it is clear, that not only Churchyards, but Churches, not only Churches, but Endowments, glebe lands, and glebe Houses, and *all services* of the Church, both ordinary, and occasional, are *public property*, that those, who at present hold or administer them, are merely "Tenants at will," under the State as the great Proprietor, and that they may, without any injustice, be put to any other use which may seem expedient to the Legislature, or may be, with sufficient pressure demanded by the People. It is of little avail to oppose this principle by reasoning and history, though both concur in repudiating it. It *may* be, and *it is* very true that, when the Endowments were assigned and Churches built, it was done *not by the Nation*, but by the *Church itself*, through wealthy and powerful Benefactors, Kings, Princes, Bishops, and Lords of Land; and that, if these benefactions were made for the advantage of the Nation, it was at a time when the Nation and the Church were co-extensive, when in the words of Hooker (E.P. Book viii.), "there was not a man of the Church of England but the same man was also a member of the Commonwealth, nor any member of the Commonwealth which was not also of the Church of England." When, in the progress of events, divisions arose (however just, or unjust, the causes may be considered), and many members of the Commonwealth formed separate religious Societies, or Denominations, for themselves, and, of their own motion, discarded the ministrations of the Church, rejected her discipline, and separated from her body, it is manifest that, by their own act, renouncing their allegiance, they forfeited the privileges of the Church, to which they and their fathers had belonged. And thus it is by a palpable fallacy alone that any claim can be upheld of a *right* to use the Church, its Fabrics, its Endowments, by any Englishman upon the ground of his being, simply, an integral part of the English Nation. Still it is lost labour to reason the case; the wave of Liberalism has set in upon us, with increasing power. It is becoming more and more the wolf's law in contending with the lamb, and when this is the case, "stat pro ratione *voluntas*." It is also observable that while demands are made on the one side with ever-increasing boldness, they are frequently met on the other, with the ready and popular expedient of self-denying concession.

So much for the first kind of aggression. It is however, an aggression of another kind which is most serious, and most to be feared, though this, like the former is an offshoot, or development of the fallacious assumption that the Church of England is the *National* Church. The encroachment in this view is upon the distinctive character of the Church, and tends to degrade her from being "the pillar and ground of the Truth," into the table of a camera obscura to reflect together all varieties of religious opinion and to exhibit at once all shades of all "schools of thought," from the lowest depths of Socinian rationalism to the highest flights of Romish superstition. In another, somewhat different form, the aim is to accommodate the services, and the ministrations of the Church to the principles or tastes of those who discard distinctions of order, and make light of differences of Creed, whose mind is, if it be rightly understood, to melt down and reduce to an elementary state all formularies of Faith, and all services of Divine worship, that out of the crucible of religious Liberalism they might bring forth a new-modelled worship, in which all the enlightened of the Nation might join in the Brotherhood of a sublimated and renovated Humanity. In the meantime, and before this desirable fusion can be effected, the expedient is to be tried of an interchange of Services by different Denominations within the walls of the same Sacred Buildings.

It is surely well that all members of the Church of England who acknowledge their responsibility to contend for the Faith in its purity and integrity, at once to look these perilous movements boldly in the face, and not to defer the beginning of resistance to a time when half the power of resistance will have been taken away, —to a time when the forecast shadows have given place to the substance, and the evils long before devised and threatened, have come upon them.

In order that nothing may be omitted by that great Enemy who is ever the Sower of Tares in the great Householder's field, to distract the Body of the Faithful, and to foment divisions, *two new orders of the Episcopate* have risen up in our land, one within our very borders; each, in its own way though in widely different directions, welcoming into its allegiance, and with the promise of special privileges, those who are dissatisfied with that branch of the Church in which they were baptized, and need, or seem to need, for their spiritual advantage a more orderly discipline, or a closer and more intimate fellowship. The new Order, which comes from America, offers itself to those who cannot dispense with Bishops, but are out of heart with the proved inability of their own Bishops to drive away errors and heresies, and to maintain wholesome discipline, and who see the body to which they once belonged, becoming more and more a congeries of separate congregations, ministered to with different rites of worship, and in some, not insignificant, particulars professing different views of doctrine: *Quàm variæ linguis, habitu tam vestis et armis*. The other new Order, which is said to come to us from Rome, and the Bishops of which, for the present, lie concealed from the public view, and are made known to the initiated only, is framed for the use and behoof of those who, abhorring the Reformation, and all that belongs to it, distrust the spiritual authority of the Episcopate of the English Church, or find their own Bishops so fettered by Statutes of the Realm, and hindered by their own lukewarmness, or by prudential considerations, that they *do* not, *can*not, or *will* not afford them a due participation in all the privileges which, as they conceive, pertain to the members of Christ's Holy Church, as Christ Himself instituted it, and as the best ages (Mediæval?) received it.

These are the perils of the Church from within and from without. Is there any "balm in Gilead?" Is there any Physician there? So that the grievous wounds, now threatening us with dissolution, and in themselves worse than dissolution—for surely strifes and divisions, heresies and schisms are worse than all—may yet be healed? No doubt the "wisdom which cometh from above," seconded by Divine power and grace, is quite indispensible to give effect to the best devised counsels of men: and, if at any time, the Psalmist's touching words of exhortation were seasonable, they are so *now*: "O, pray for the peace of Jesusalem." Such is the

first duty, and the high privilege of all her faithful citizens; for these all, with one accord, set their seal to the declaration of the Prophet:—"not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts," and, "when the enemy cometh in like a flood the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." But then, again, the Spirit of God works by suitable and prepared instruments, inspiring the salutary counsel, and then bringing it to good effect. What, therefore, if there be *no counsel?* "Where no counsel is, the people fall." What if, instead of any plan to correct evils, to strengthen cords of discipline, to secure the Faith in its essentials, and to banish diverse and strange doctrines, instead of the loud and warning blast of the trumpet, or the watchman's distinct cry from the battlements of our Zion, there are no better utterances than the gentle and soporific whispers of charity, forbearance, mutual respect, co-operation:

> For forms of faith, let graceless bigots fight;
> He can't be wrong, whose life is in the right.

Then, indeed, the times of mere Reformation have passed away; and our one hope is in *Reconstruction*, and, in order to this, emancipation at any cost from the secular fetters by which we are bound. If it be so that kings and queens have ceased to be able to act as fosterers of the Church, and if the Legislature of the Land is so far from being a part of the Church, that it has no necessary religious character at all, and cannot claim to be a portion of the Commonwealth of Christendom, then, the bonds by which Church and State have, in years past, been profitably and happily united, may have become, instead of instruments of co-operation, mere fetters of bondage, from which Samson must shake himself in time, or from henceforth be contented to serve as a grinder at the mill, or to be brought forth to make sport to the scoffers in the festal days of their mirth.

We must in candour confess that, having given expression to difficulties, we have ourselves no hopeful remedy to propose. The evils to the country, especially in small rural parishes, which would result from a separation of Church and State, involving (as of course it would) *disendowment*, would be greater, and more numerous, than it is easy to describe. So many, so intimate, and so deeply-rooted are the kindly offices subsisting between the Parsonage and the Parish, as a rule, that the consequence of breaking these charities of social and spiritual life deserve more than a few passing thoughts. O, for some Father or Prince in Israel to be raised up, as a Judge and Saviour amongst us, who might, as an interpreter of the Divine Will, disentangle for us the puzzled threads of our Ecclesiastical Polity, solve the (alas!) too hard problems, by which our wisest are bewildered, and give us counsels of *peace* without urging upon us the sacrifice of *Truth!* Meanwhile, the last expedient of all is the energy of despair. Yet a while, let watchfulness and prayer be maintained without ceasing, and our wise men and chief pastors seek for us the right way. He who cherishes Hope, in the diligent use of all his faculties and opportunities in order to attain its object, is the true friend of Christianity and of the Church; and whatever may be the ultimate state, *he* shall have, at least the merit and the praise accorded by Rome of old in the time of her severest depression to her hopeful, but unsuccessful commander, "*agi gratias, quod de Republicâ non pesperasset.*"

POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY: ITS SOCIAL AND MORAL TENDENCIES.

By the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

Twenty minutes might serve to expound all that we know of Thales or Anaxagoras; but the time is too short for the whole system of Positive Philosophy. It may serve for an effort to seize the great principle which, under that name, is adopted as a guide by many scientific men at the present time, and to test its sufficiency.

To plunge at once into midstream—the favourite view of the functions of science at present is as follows:—The man of science sees that the facts around him are of two kinds—those which he can hope to know, and those which he can never know. Those which he can know are the impressions which his senses give him, and the general groups into which these form themselves under careful observation; and those which he cannot pretend to know are those about which the observation by the senses gives no help; as the future of the soul, the First Cause, the destiny of man, his primary origin, the nature of infinite space. Warned by long experience, the man of science, refusing to waste his time on impossible knowledge, and to scatter his powers in mere guesses, will apply his time to the study of the visible only; in other words, will apply to nothing but the material world and its phenomena. He does not deny that there are higher things; he only says they cannot be studied under scientific conditions. "That," says M. Littré—the most prominent of Comte's disciples—"that which is above the reach of positive knowledge as, in natural things, the doctrine of infinite space, and, in intellectual things, the chain of causes without limit, is inaccessible to the mind of man; but inaccessible does not mean null and non-existent. Immensity, material and intellectual, is closely bound to our knowledge; and by this very alliance it becomes a positive idea, and of the same order as the rest: that is, when we come in contact with it, this immensity appears with its double character of reality and inaccessibility. It is an ocean which beats on our shore, and for which we have neither ship nor sail, but of which the clear view is at once wholesome and formidable" (*Preface d'un Disciple*).

The admission that there are facts which we must perforce abstain from knowing is startling, especially with another admission that must be made, that the bounds of the unknowable are drawn on this side of the subjects which have occupied the minds of men most deeply from the world's beginning down to the foundation of the Positive Philosophy in the first half of the nineteenth century. No one can doubt that the doctrine of the soul's immortality has played a great part in the world's course; that the belief in God and Christ has kindled much zeal, and is responsible for much of the work, and for no little of the contention, of mankind throughout all history. These beliefs are not matters of knowledge—they belong to the unknowable group. If so they simulate knowledge very effectually. There was a very clear practical knowledge in those who, when the Crusaders brought back leprosy with them to Europe, made a league against the new foe, called the Order of St. Lazarus, contended with it, built houses for the sufferers, gave them tender care, tried to clear Europe of its new pest. This movement was a direct obedience to the command of Christ to heal the sick; and out of it have come very tangible fruits. The probable modification of the disease, which was as

surely contagious in the middle ages as it is surely less contagious now; the spread of hospitals over Europe, which no third-rate town can now do without;—these are results which are cognisable by science; for it can see an hospital and study the disease. I profess myself unable to understand why the motive power in the mind of those who first made lazar-houses is to be treated as without the sphere of knowledge. That which guides men is their mind; and if one man is urged to acts of bravery, of charity, of endurance, of public succour, by something that sways his mind; where is the completeness of a philosophy which excludes all his motives, because they belong to the dark and inexplorable region decreed to be beyond the reach of science? For aught we see, a hospital is as good as a steam-engine, and even better. It is a prudish and artificial system which will only allow us to study the hospital as a building with stately walls, as an engine for reducing the average of sickness, as an element in the great question of the provision for the poor; but will not let you reason on the motives of those who, before this social question emerged, trod with sure instinct the road of love, and provided for the social difficulties with prophetic skill.

What is knowledge! The Positivist makes it his lawful boast that the foundation of his philosophy is the mathematical laws. He will have—he is daily receiving—his reward! The results of science that we have seen are splendid; and we owe deep thankfulness for them, not indeed to Comte or to Bacon, but to Him Who has allowed His creatures to turn the beautiful laws of the universe to such rich account. But the laws of science are not all; they are not the greatest part of the things which interest mankind. The time may come when with a perfect social science an enlightened community may feel, when they are observing their duties, that they are obeying the laws of science and of expediency. It is certainly not yet arrived; and meantime a good deal of obedience is elicited from men to the laws which once were written on two tables of stone, and which the civilised world has recognised as divine. In like manner a good many lives are shaped to high purposes, not from a scientific calculation that something called *altruism* is the best policy, but because of a persuasion that this life is not all, and that it is better to live with a view to connect this life by work and self-denial with the life to come. I fail to understand why the name of knowledge is to be refused to the belief in God and in a future state, and to be awarded to the deductions which some few people make, perhaps, before they act, as to the social result of the act they are about to do. The difference cannot lie in the greater degree of certainty of the latter as compared with the former. Knowledge is of various shades or grades of certainty, yet it is not on that account to be denied the name of knowledge. We have lately had to alter our chemical tables because of a change in the atom of hydrogen, and our astronomical, because of a new measurement of the sun's distance; yet no one denies to chemistry and to astronomy the name of science. The propositions in question are not so certain, as that through any point, only one line can be drawn perpendicular to a given line; but then this theorem, if safe against revision, owes that quality to its abstract and therefore its unpractical nature. What is knowledge? It is that mental condition which gives to man an insight into the world around him. It need not be complete; from the nature of it this may be impossible. It may be almost unconscious; as that of the frivolous mother who, overcome with a new tenderness, bends over her cradled new-born babe, to give it that succour and tending which are God's ordinance for its preservation. It is well-nigh unconscious; but it guides her, and she will find it a true guide, and the result she hopes for will follow. In many matters of practice the best knowledge is the unconscious, startling though this may sound. Who knows music the best? The child of ten years, painfully limping through its scales; or the deaf Beethoven, sweeping the mute keys in a pianissimo, heard by no other ear but his own; for the ear is deaf, but the soul is a concert-hall of song? Who walks the best? The child whom we teach to put one foot before the other, or those in whose unconscious march there is no trace of rules or training, but only free grace and dignity? Mark the orator, who can pour forth, without five minutes' preparation, words of passion which overbear the reason, and by their very vehemence earn the praise which should be the meed of wisdom. He surely knows the use of language. But the rules of grammar and of rhetoric are far from him. His almost miraculous power of speech belongs now to the unconscious region. Which of us has not at some time seen one of those masterly sketches, by which, in a few strokes, the very heart and meaning of a face or a landscape are seized and fixed? You could not get, for the artist cannot supply, an account of the rules by which this feat is done; the power has come from conscious preparation, but it is now beyond that stage. Wonder, but ask no rules. Now, if this be so, you cannot exclude from the purview of philosophy knowledge that is wholly or partly unconscious on that account. But the Positivist says that definite and distinct conclusions cannot be found in those regions; and, of course, where there are no deductions to be drawn there is no knowledge. Definite results depend much on the abstract and simple nature of the premises; and even science finds the force of that limitation. The rules of arithmetic and geometry are sure, and will never be successfully disputed; and if Mr. Mill can conceive a world in which two and two make five, none of us can readily follow him. But when the sociologist attempts to predict from past inductions how men will act in some future emergency, he knows that the disturbing elements in human nature are so many, the facts so complicated, that he will only pretend to some general foresight, not far better than a guess of an instructed mind. Now, let us own that much of the knowledge men seek after is and must ever remain indefinite. I look at your microscope, your balance, your electroscope, and admit, perhaps not without some vain regret, that for the moral and spiritual world we have no much instruments of precision. But I cannot expect them. The astronomer observes the phenomenon of a burning star, and he too wishes for instruments by which he could seize all the facts of that portentous spectacle—the dissolution of a sun or world. He must rest content with what the polariscope can tell him—that a world of burning hydrogen is before him. He does not abandon astronomy because he cannot make a map of the scene of cosmic conflagration. He is right. We, too, concerned in our degree with the eternal future of the soul of man, we admit that we cannot so reason out our belief that all might be coerced by our reasonings, and attracted by results at once definite and of prime import to mankind. It is the same with the cognate principle of moral obligation. Kant, the severest critic of the boundary lines of human science, has left standing after his analysis the so-called "categorical imperative;" which, put into plainest words, is this, that the fact that I feel bound to act according

to a law of duty within me, apart from consequences and calculation, is the best evidence that we have for our connection with a higher being, higher laws, a more permanent system. It stands in Kant's system reasoned out, in the system which of all others is relied on by the modern sensualists; and yet we are told that for the future it is outside the realm of knowledge altogether! Why? Because you cannot give its formula like that of picrid acid? If science has no place for what Kant proves, and strong men live on, science is incomplete, and the rule of exclusion is artificial, and instead of a new system of knowledge, we have before us an appeal to the weariness of religious strife, and metaphysical argument, which has come over men at various times in the course of history, and which prevailed in the age of the Greek sophists, in the time of Hume and Voltaire, in the days of Comte and others amongst ourselves. It is not so much a system, as a mood—a condition of exhaustion, which will surely pass.

When Comte enunciated his imposing dogma as follows:—"Positive philosophy is the whole body of human knowledge; human knowledge is the result of the study of the forces belonging to matter, and of the conditions or laws governing those forces"—he did not take account of the nature of those whose freedom of research and study he sought to repress. Nothing is so hard to obey as this kind of restriction. When our staid and positive British Association, bound by its very charter to know nothing but science, meets in an eloquent and excitable island, there is an outburst of religious strife that lasts for months; and all agree that the challenge came from the side of positive science, which could not leave the unknowable unknown. The mind will not lay aside its highest prerogative, of discussing its own origin, its own destiny, its own perfectibility by the aid of faith, with the faculties that God has given it for its own. You bring us to that solemn shore, and, our feet planted on the last fact, we must be content to look out on the mysterious inaccessible ocean. Thus far; no farther! There is no knowledge beyond. But we are the children of the sea-kings, who sleep in death with their ships beside them, ready, on the first waking call, to take again to the sea that cradled them and gave them death! You cannot plough it, nor mow it, nor track it with iron bands; it has its darkness, its sunlight, its fits of change, its storms, its death. But it is ours; and its very vagueness and vastness call us to explore it. Stay you on the shore; we have a duty laid on us. In strong ship, if that be possible, in any shallop that we can find, if it be not, we will dare and try the ocean which you abandon to us.

No; the field of knowledge will not be so circumscribed. And the age that boasts of its science is the most unpromising for such tyrannical limitations. The voice of the people is against them. Mankind, insufficiently imbued with science, feels where it stands and what it has to do. The worship of God occupies perhaps the largest and most various page of all the world's history. The degree in which the law of duty sways is the best test of the nobleness of a man or a nation. The awful problem of life and death, to be solved by every one, makes the dullest of us an inquirer, and the most careless it fills with wonder:—

> "Ich komm,' ich weiss nicht woher,—
> Ich geh', ich weiss nicht wohin;
> Ich bin, ich weiss nicht was
> Mich wundert das ich so fröhlich bin."

A necessity is laid on us to think of these things. To view them with apathy would argue a defective mind. Lose their hold on the problems of life, of death, and of eternity, mankind will never. All claim the right to think of them which arises from their being part and parcel of themselves. And to some, thinking of them deeply, as devotees of science think of their subjects of inquiry, they shine with a clear brightness of knowledge and belief, they afford a satisfying guidance, they bring into harmony the lower labours of life. If man "has necessarily been produced"—I use the forcible words of my friend and Chancellor—"has necessarily been produced either by the spontaneous universal suffrage and co-operation of all atoms of matter, or by one Creator,"* man himself must have an opinion on that subject. Let us not mistake a momentary disgust at the disputes of religion and at the poor results of metaphysical inquiry, for a call to abandon all but material speculations. Let us not rail against science, for the knowledge of the laws of matter is valuable to us as far as it goes; and its reach is great. But science asks too much when it requires the abnegation of all other knowledge and belief. To any teacher who demands it we reply that the nature of man is against it, the history of our race is against it, the aspirations of the race forbid it. You offer a charming vision; all knowledge shall be certain and clear. But when we learn the price—that we are to sacrifice the largest portion of the domain of contemplation, we decline the bargain, and go on our own way.

———:o:———

"WORK AND PLAY."

The Rev. C. H. Grundy, Organizing Secretary of the Rochester Diocesan Society, delivered the following address on "Work and Play," to the Reigate Church Teachers' Association.

There are two classes of people in the world—happy and unhappy. Life was like a see-saw: there were many ups and downs, and those who were constantly at work and had no leisure were not happy, because they had "business on the brain," and could not find time for relaxation of the mind. He thought a happy man was one who, having much work to do, did his best, and left the rest to take its chance. Work and Play combined commenced from infancy and continued through life with the majority of persons; and the playground and schoolroom existed always, however they might be disguised. At school, when a child had really mastered the words c-a-t and d-o-g, a deal of work had been accomplished; but it was difficult for an infant to comprehend *why* c-a-t should spell cat. There are different kinds of school work—taking the form of reading, languages, examinations, and teaching—so also there are counter-attractions for play, in the shape of amusements, society and holidays. The definition of work, as given in the dictionary, to his mind was not a good one, as his idea of work was "the mind *on* duty trying to do that duty." So also of play: he would define this as "the mind *off* duty, following its own sweet will." Work was what we *must* do; play was optional, as we cannot play to order. Some playing needs more *distinct effort*, as in a boat-race, when real hard work is requisite for a thorough training, though it is only considered as play. One man's play is another man's work; and a friend of his, an Oxford Professor, enjoyed recreation by looking out a number of Hebrew or Arabic roots, though he (the speaker) did not choose these for his holiday recreation. Some boys delighted themselves by making collections

* Sir E. Beckett's "Origin of Laws of Nature."

of butterflies or stamps, and worked in their leisure moments to find out their history. This was their re-creation. The sense of duty as associated with work might be seen in various forms, as a man chopping turnips had to be careful he did not chop himself. In selling chickweed the vendor had to look about and find out those who wanted his wares; so also in everything, whether it was preaching a sermon or making a pudding, the mind had to be on duty, and with the Apostle he would say, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might." He was speaking to earnest men and women, the sons and daughters of mental toil, and having many anxieties. One part of the work of a teacher was the knowing "how to choose well," when to administer reproof or praise. It was a good thing to begin with the latter, and work the former in like a wedge, so that the children would take i home to themselves. The teacher should have unlimited patience, and know where to stop, following the butler's advice, who, when asked by his master, who was greedily devouring some vension, "whether it would not make a good hash next day?" replied "Yes, sir, if you'll *stop now*." The brain should "pour out well" when imparting knowledge, and a display of the powers of the teacher was not the only thing wanted. The work of teaching was one of the noblest of callings, and ought to inspire confidence and hope; for

> 'Tis education forms the common mind;
> Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined.

The essentials in a teacher ought to be—1. "The sense of a mission." The mind must always be on the alert and in front. 2. Health was a great framer of the mind, and always feeling out of sorts did not improve the temper. He would advise those present to study their health. 3. Adaptibility, or the art of puttings things before the minds of the pupils. 4. Ardour and plenty of animal spirits should be possessed by a teacher. 5. Contentment was necessary, as wanting to be always changing never did any good. He advocated good salaries for good teachers, so that their minds should be easy on that point. 6. Pungency was another essential, as also (7) a boundless love for babies. The teacher should likewise have (8) practical knowledge; and he would illustrate this by a story he heard of a farmer who, when shown a very large turnip, asked what it would be when "peeled and boiled?" So he would say—Let them be well grounded in their work, and have a firmness about them. Lastly, he would like them to have plenty of calmness and endurance, not get tired of their work before the proper time. He read a story lately of a man and his boy (Chirper), who, when asked if he did not feel tired of drawing his costermonger's barrow about, replied, "You see them plants? Well, when they's all sold then Chirper and me'll be tired, and not afore." This was the kind of feeling the teacher should have. When, however, the playtime came he would advise them to throw responsibility to the winds. He thought it well to divide one's evenings into three portions; two evenings for self-improvement, two for home, and two for amusement. He did not like the man that always was thinking of his work, and had it for breakfast, dinner, and tea; but would ask them not to worry and fuss about the examinations. There are various pleasures, such as anticipation and retrospection of a holiday; also conversations, public entertainments, and reading. His final advice would be, "Do not grow old and commonplace, and never expect gratitude for your work; but be thrifty, energetic, and put faith in God."

BISHOP BEDELL

In our impression of Saturday, the 9th of October, there appeared an article for which we are much indebted to the Rev. Courtenay Moore, entitled "What the Church of Ireland owes to the Church of England for Bishop Bèdell." It may interest some of our readers before whom the subject has been thus recently brought, to see a few extracts sent to us by an Irish correspondent, taken from a lecture by the Right Hon. Joseph Napier, LL.D., ex-Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and delivered in 1863 before the "Dublin Young Men's Christian Association." Having noticed some of the most remarkable incidents connected with the life of William Bèdell when Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, Sir Joseph passed on to speak in the following eloquent language of Bèdell's elevation to the Episcopate. "Bèdell's care and government of the College as Provost had been noticed at head quarters. In 1629 the See of Kilmore and Ardagh had become vacant, and he was now chosen to fill the office of a Bishop. The state of the Irish Church was deplorable. The Court of Rome had recently succeeded in planting throughout the country the complete organization of a rival system. In Mr. King's admirable history, and in the instructive volume of sermons on the Irish Church which were preached in Westminster Abbey, and have since been published, by Canon Wordsworth, you may read what I cannot more than glance at, but it explains much of the past and present in Ireland, and with reference to the future should be studied with thoughtful attention. The appointment of such a man as Bèdell at such a crisis, was an earnest of good will to the Church and people. The Papal policy is truthfully described by the late Bishop Doyle in a passage quoted by the Attorney-General (Mr. O'Hagan, now Lord O'Hagan) in a published argument. "Thus it was, that in bad times, in times of turbulence and barbarism, the claims of the Pope to the sovereignty of almost every kingdom in Europe grew up in silence and were admitted and sanctioned by nearly all the ruling powers. *It must be quite obvious that these claims had not their origin in the Gospel, nor in the doctrine of the Catholic Church*, but in the state of society, in the mistaken zeal, or in the ambition of some Popes, a zeal or an ambition excited and directed by an insatiable avarice, pride, and thirst of power in their followers and dependents."

"Bèdell," continued the lecturer, "had every qualification for his high and holy office. He grappled boldly with every form of ecclesiastical abuse. He enforced residence, and put down pluralities; he convened his clergy, and in the spirit of a true pastor, pressed upon their consciences the sacred responsibility of their office. The exactions and impositions by which the people were oppressed under the ecclesiastical Courts 'vexed his righteous soul;' for he had a passionate love of justice, and in a memorable contest with the Chancellor of the Diocese, which for years he fought single-handed, he manifested such a firmness of purpose, such moral courage, and such a spirit of self-sacrifice as is, I believe, unexampled in the history of the Church. 'My Lord' (he said in a letter to Laud, then Bishop of London), 'I do thus account that amongst all the impediments of the work of God amongst us, there is not any greater than the abuse of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This is the opinion of the most godly, judicious, and learned man that I have known, and the demonstration thereof is plain. The people pierce not into the inward reasons; they are sensible *in the purse*. Let us preach

never so powerfully, and live never so piously ourselves, so long as the officers in our Courts do prey upon the people, they account us no better than publicans. And so much the more deservedly, because we are called spiritual men and reformed Christians.' ". . . . . "The efforts of the Bishop to save the poor people from a grinding system of exaction and oppression, soon endeared him to them, as the poor man's friend and best protector. But there was another way to win their affections—a way that Parliament had proscribed and State-policy discouraged—the use of the Irish language. 'The people have souls,' said the godly Bishop, 'and they ought not to be neglected until they can learn English.'" . . . "In all his reforms Bishop Bèdell sought for guidance in God's Holy Word. He appealed to the text, 1 Corinthians xiv. 19: 'Yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.' This was his warrant for preferring humbler men, able to converse with the natives, and perform divine offices in their own language, rather than placing over the people men of greater abilities and learning that wanted the language. And, as in the case of pluralities, to set an example and take away every show of argument, he resigned one of his bishoprics (Ardagh), retaining Kilmore only; so, in a like spirit, he began the study of the Irish language in his fifty-ninth year, and by patient diligence he attained a good perfection, by which he was enabled to leave that precious legacy to Ireland, the Bèdell Bible."

The Rev. Courtenay Moore has noticed at the close of his article upon Bishop Bèdell, the deeply interesting circumstances which took place at the funeral of that prelate, to whom Ireland owes so much. But although in the concluding paragraphs of Sir Joseph Napier's lecture, the same circumstances are described, the peroration of the accomplished lecturer is so truly eloquent, that we cannot forbear quoting it. "The Bishop had expressed a wish to be laid close to the remains of his beloved wife, near a sycamore, which his own hands had planted—there to be buried without pomp or ceremony. But when his family and attendants were proceeding to the spot, the rebel chief of the district, with his troop met and escorted the funeral procession. His body was committed to the earth, there to rest until the archangels' trump shall sound. In silent prayer his few and faithful relatives and friends parted with one who had been indeed their 'father in God.' The rebel chieftain, with his company under arms, gathered around the grave; and a Roman Catholic Priest who had been one of his tenants, had witnessed his blameless life, and doubtless often shared his kindness, stood close at hand. They came not to revile an alien, or to curse a heretic; they paid him the last honours of a soldier, and he was hallowed as a saint. 'Over the grave where our hero was buried,' the rebel troop discharged a funeral volley and 'left him alone in his glory.' The kind-hearted priest thought of the gentle spirit that had shaken from its emancipated wings the dust and the dews of mortality, and soared aloft amongst the 'just made perfect,' and he breathed forth that memorable prayer, 'Oh, may *my* soul be with Bèdell.' May the spirit of Bèdell be with us in this divided land. That faithful, fearless, loving spirit subdued the enmity and won the affections of all. His were not carnal weapons, the bigots' scowl, the tongue of strife, the narrow heart. The pen of inspiration has fitly traced his epitaph. 'In all things approving himself as the minister of God; in much patience, in afflictions, in imprisonments, in labours, in watchings, by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, as unknown and yet well known, as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing, as poor, yet making many rich, as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.'"

CORRESPONDENCE.

BAPTISM.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—Can any of your correspondents tell me what is the proper force of the words "by water" in the first prayer in the Office for Infant Baptism? Are they to be connected with "save" or with "perishing"? A reference to 1 St. Pet. iii. 20 would decide in favour of the former. But in the Latin Prayer-book of Messrs. Bright and Medd the words are rendered "ne in aquis perirent." If they belong to "save," a slight pause should be made in reading after the word "perishing."

November 5, 1880. H. S. G.

An hon. sec. of the Additional Curates Society suggests to the executive a little more caution in the selection of cases, the details of which are published in order to excite liberality. "For the last two years at least a case has been published in Report and Home Mission Field as one of urgency in the deanery for which I am hon. sec. The case is represented as being that of a parish of 4,000 population, with one clergyman; the fact being that there are four clergy working in it, and it is the best manned parish in the central town of the deanery.

The *Nonconformist* states that a pleasing instance of the good feeling which exists between Churchmen and Dissenters in the Clapham district was given on Thursday morning, when the Rev. Aubrey C. Price, vicar of St. James's, Clapham-park-road, opened a fancy bazaar in aid of the fund which is being raised for the erection of a new Baptist chapel, in place of the present structure on Clapham-common, which has proved too small for the increasing congregation. The bazaar is being held in the chapel itself; and, in declaring it open, Mr. Price expressed in most emphatic terms the great pleasure which it gave him to take part in the proceedings. He had the greatest love and respect for their pastor, and for the work in which they were engaged. He said he was expressing the real feelings of his heart, and thanked them most heartily for the privilege of being present.

The Rev. Joseph Bardsley, M.A., vicar of Bradford, was presented on Monday evening with an illuminated address, from the congregation and parishioners of St. Dunstan's, Stepney, together with silver tea-service and a purse of £400. The address alluded to Mr. Bardsley's eleven years' faithful ministry in Stepney, and the special works carried on by him in the parish—namely, the building of the three new churches, the restoration of the parish church, and the opening of Mission-rooms, all of which are well attended. Besides parochial work, the part taken by Mr. Bardsley on the School Board for London, and in other efforts for the Church at large, was duly set forth. The presentation took place in the Vestry-hall, and great regret was expressed at Mr. Bardsley's removal from the neighbourhood. Mr. Spencer Charrington presided.

At Bournemouth it isproposed to build a new church and to make it a memorial of the late Rev. Alexander Modern Bennett. The first incumbency will be offered to his son, the Rev. Alex. S. Bennett, and the future patronage will be offered to the Keble College Advowson Trustees. In order to obtain the consent of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners it is necessary to provide for the building of a substantial church (or portion of a church), capable of holding 300 worshippers, with £1,000 as the nucleus of an endowment, and £150 as a repair fund.

Visitors to "the Dukery," North Notts, are probably acquainted with an exquisite specimen of late Norman work — the roofless church at Steetley. Though it is only 56ft. long, it includes a nave, chancel, and eastern apse; and in Mr. Robert White's Worksop drawings are given of some of its very remarkable detail. This beautiful little gem has now been carefully restored, and it was on Tuesday week re-opened by the Bishop of Lichfield. It will now be served by the rector of Whitwell.

We have been requested by Mr. Merest to insert the following letter addressed to him by the Bishop of London:—"London House, November 2, 1880.—Rev. Sir—I have examined your letters of orders and testimonials, and am willing that, for the space of three months from this date, that you should officiate in the diocese of London, whenever you may be requested to do so by the incumbent or minister of any parish or district therein.—I am, rev. sir, your faithful servant, J. London.—Rev. J. J. Merset."

Consequent on the creation of the new diocese of Liverpool, the diocese of Chester has been formed into two archdeaconries, styled respectively the archdeaconries of Chester and Macclesfield. To the latter of these the coadjutor Bishop of the diocese has been appointed. Bishop Kelly is a late Scholar of Clare College, Cambridge, and graduated in 1854. In 1867 he became coadjutor to Bishop Field of Newfoundland. Having served in this capacity for several years, he was subsequently himself appointed Bishop of Newfoundland, but resigned in 1877.

The following letter has been circulated throughout the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, and we are informed that upwards of one hundred and seventy names have been received in support of Mr. Fenn's candidature:—"We beg leave to inform you that it is intended to propose the name of the Rev. J. F. Fenn, B.D., incumbent of Christ Church, Cheltenham, Honorary Canon of Gloucester, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, as a fit and proper person to fill the place of Proctor for the clergy in Convocation, vacant by the decease of the late lamented Canon Barlow; and we respectfully commend Canon Fenn to you."

The Bishop of Lincoln has opened the Mission-chapel of St. Saviour's, Little Gonerby, near Grantham. The licence having been read, his lordship laid the instrument upon the holy table, and offered prayer for the generous donor of the site, all who had furthered the work, and all who should worship therein. Evening Prayer was then proceeded with, the vicar of Grantham (Canon Garfit) intoning, and Mrs. Cecil Fisher accompanying the responses on the new harmonium. An interesting ceremony then took place — the laying of hands upon three lay-readers — Mr. Provost, who had been attached in the same capacity to the church of St. Mark's, Peterborough, and Messrs. Saywell and G. B. Strickson. These having been presented by the vicar, and certified by him to "be apt and meet, for their learning and godly conversation," to exercise the office duly, the Bishop read their licenses and laid his hand upon each. "The Church's One Foundation" was then sung, and the Bishop afterwards preached an impressive sermon from the words, "Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." The chapel is situated in the midst of a comparatively new settlement of artisans, and is the result of a series of Mission services held about a year ago. It is built of red bricks, dressed sparingly with stone, with a roof of red tiles, giving the whole an exceedingly warm and comfortable appearance, and consists of a nave 40ft. by 20ft., a chancel 18ft. by 16ft., and a lean-to porch and vestry. All decorative effort has been reserved for the east end. Upon the super-altar stands an altar-cross of brass, given by Mrs. R. Lee, and on either side are vases and candlesticks. At the back a painted reredos of chaste design is reared, the work of Miss Glaister, of Southwell, whilst above all is a painted window, given as a thank-offering for special services by Mrs. Cecil Fisher. The total cost of the chapel has been about 530.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barker, Rev. John T., rector of Rushden; honorary canon of Peterborough.
Brown, Rev. Edward Utten, vicar of Besthorpe, Norfolk, on his own petition.
Edgington, Rev. Charles N., vicar of Holy Trinity, Mile-end Old-town; vicar of Hanwell.
Ellis, Rev. D. H., master of Ravenstone Hospital; precentor of St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney.
Flack, Rev. George Sutton, rector of Tattersett-with-Tatterford annexed, Norfolk.
Griffith, Rev. William, perpetual curate of Llanddewifach, Radnorshire.
Johnson, Rev. William Cowper, rector of Northwold, Norfolk.
Jones, Rev. Harry, rector of St. George's-in-the-East; prebendary of Sneating, in St. Paul's Cathedral.
Jones, Rev. H. E, curate of Lancaster; vicar of Overton.
Jones, Rev. Thomas, curate of Newcastle Emlyn; rector of Kilgerran, Pembroke.
Kelly, Right Rev. Bishop, episcopal commissary of the Bishop of Chester; Archdeacon of Macclesfield.
Kilner, Rev. F. C., Wilberforce missioner at Portsea; vicar of Potternewton.
Kirkham, Rev. Thomas, rector of St. Martin's, Manchester; vicar of Manningham (St. Paul's), Yorkshire.
Lloyd, Rev. Julius, incumbent of St. John's, Glasgow; rector of St. Ann's, Manchester.
Meares, Rev. John, perpetual curate of Harroldstone West with Lambston, Pembroke.
Paton, Rev. James, vicar of Hemingborough.
Peile, Rev. Thomas W., late vicar of Cannock; rector of St. John, Buckhurst-hill, Essex.
Stead, Rev. Edward Dymoke, vicar of Peasenhall, Suffolk.
Tottenham, Rev. Edward, vicar of Kirby Grindalyth.
Tower, Rev. Charles Marsh Ainslie, rector of Chilmark, Wilts;
Tuson, Rev. Herbert, sole charge, Morthoe, Ilfracombe, Devon.
Were, Rev. E. A., assistant master of Winchester College. vicar of North Bradley, Wilts.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Carey, Rev. Alfred Henry, at Abington Rectory, Northampton, on the 1st inst., aged 49.
Cosway, Rev. Samuel, at Chute Vicarage, Wilts, on the 31st ult., aged 70.
Duncombe, Rev. William, M.A., at 21, Langham-street, of Rokeles, Norfolk, formerly vicar of Crowle, Lincolnshire, on the 2nd inst., aged 62.
Jenner, Rev. Stephen, M.A., at Walmer, vicar of Bekesbourne, Kent, on the 7th inst.
Wallinger, Rev. William, at Tunbridge Wells, prebendary of Chichester, on the 3rd inst., aged 85.

The Church of England Pulpit.

EARLY DEVOTION TO GOD.

By the Right Rev.
THE BISHOP OF NOTTINGHAM, D.D.

Sermon Preached to the Students of Eton College, October 24th, 1880.

"O Daniel, servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest continually, able to deliver thee from the lions?"—Dan. vi. 20.

TIME was, when he who now addresses you *habitually* worshipped in this fair Chapel, the pious work of the saintly Sixth Henry of England, and listened to the exhortations of his then spiritual elders; but now, when after the lapse of many years I am again permitted to be here, not simply as an elder in my turn, but as a Father in God, my privilege is to speak to you earnestly and affectionately in God's Name, through His Holy Word. Perhaps no subject of thought could have been more appropriately suggested for consideration than the one naturally presented to us by the First Lesson read to us during this morning's service, which describes a well-known and most remarkable incident in the life of the great Prophet Daniel. He was nobly born, of the Royal house of Judah, and the very meaning of his name—"God is Judge"—seemed to foretell his coming spiritual greatness, as one of God's mightiest Prophets, and also his future high temporal position as the first Minister of the great King of Babylon, who through him was led to confess that the God of Daniel was the *living* God, stedfast for ever, whose kingdom shall not be destroyed, and whose dominion shall be even unto the end. Yet, notwithstanding all the grandeur of Daniel's coming life, as a mighty Prophet, and as one only second in authority and power to the then greatest King on earth, a terrible calamity befell him and his country in his early youth; for Jerusalem was then captured, when Jehoiakim was King of Judah, and Daniel was carried away as a captive-slave to Babylon, and thus parted from his country, his relations, and friends, but happily not parted from his *God*. For three years he and his three godly companions—Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah—after new names had been given them, were gradually educated and prepared for service in the Palace of Babylon under one of the Royal officers. How bitter must have been their lot at first, when they thought of their lost Zion, their lost parents, their lost friends; but a far *worse* thing might have at once befallen them, had they not remained true to God through the temptation of *luxury*, and the transgression of the Law of God, which as the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, they were bound to keep, according to the Mosaic Dispensation. Ashpenaz was commanded by Nebuchadnezzar to instruct these youths in the learning and tongue of the Chaldeans, which was a necessary step, and one that could not have been otherwise than beneficial to them; but he was also commanded to do more for them, viz., to feed them daily from the Royal table, and to supply them with the Royal drink. No doubt this meat and drink were the best that wealthy Babylon could supply to her great King, and naturally lads would delight in such good things as they had never had before; but happily they remembered *God's will*, and His law, so that Daniel was "moved in heart" to determine "that he would not defile himself with the portion of the King's meat, nor with the wine which he drank." This was not merely because he feared the danger of self-indulgence, but because he knew he should then be partaking of food that had in part been offered to idols, and killed with the blood, and then be drinking wine from which libations had been made to those idols, contrary to God's Law, which they had at least ever *striven* to observe. Hence he prayed to Melzar, an officer acting under Ashpenaz, that he and his holy companions might simply be fed with pulse and water, when, after a trial of ten days, as they then distinctly looked better than all others under instruction, they were allowed to have their own way, and greatly encouraged henceforth to continue stedfast in their faith, and firm in their obedience to God, through whose Grace they had been enabled to preserve themselves from sin, and had received an evident blessing from God; for we are expressly told that *God* gave them knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom, and that the King found them ten times better in all matters of wisdom and understanding than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his nation. But this very gift of superior wisdom endangered Daniel's life three years afterwards, for then Nebuchadnezzar, after the manner of an Eastern despot, would have destroyed all the wise men of Babylon, among whom the young Daniel was justly numbered, because they could not tell him what was his forgotten dream, nor its meaning! When, however, this sweeping decree of death had gone forth, Daniel first entreated the chief of the executioners to delay its fulfilment, and then, hurrying to the King, assured him that he would soon be able to comply with his desire. But *how* did he seek to accomplish this? He did not have recourse to his *books*, he did not seek for knowledge through the *stars*, he did not trust to *himself*; but, after having asked his holy brethren to come to his house, he urged them to join with him in *earnest prayer* to the God of heaven that knowledge might be graciously vouchsafed to him, sufficient to save his life, and the lives of all the wise men of Babylon, through his description of the king's for-

gotten dream and its interpretation. No *immediate* answer to his prayer ensued; but at *night* God visited his faithful servant, and *revealed* the secret, together with its explanation, which was needed to save him and his unjustly condemned companions from death. Then a hymn of ardent thanksgiving arose from the inspired lips of the young Daniel, in which he said, "I thank Thee and praise Thee, O thou God of my fathers, who hast given me wisdom and might, and hast made known unto me what we desired of Thee, for Thou *hast* now made known unto us the king's matter." The next day he approached the king, and described the quadriform image, which he had seen representing the four great empires of the world, together with its meaning, which had such an astounding effect upon Nebuchadnezzar, that he actually fell down before Daniel, whom he had sentenced to die, and *adored* him as the servant of that Mighty God whom he now acknowledged to be Lord of kings, after which he raised him to the highest office in his kingdom as Ruler over all the province of Babylon, and at his desire promoted his three holy brethren also to places of high honour under him. Daniel escaped the *fiery* trial to which these were soon exposed, perhaps because their accusers dared not aim at so high a one as him, who was held in the greatest honour by the king; he suffered not from his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's second dream, foretelling his temporary madness, nor from his boldly urging him to repent and reform, that his coming tribulation might be mitigated; neither was he injured through his dangerous explanation of Belshazzar's sentence, written in mysterious words by a mysterious hand, on the wall of his Palace, when he and his Court were blasphemously drinking out of the holy vessels dedicated to the service of the Most High at Jerusalem, and desecrating by libations offered to the false Gods of Babylon; for then he received the promised reward at once, before the following fatal night, when Belshazzar was slain, his kingdom was lost, and Darius, the Median conqueror, ruled in his stead, as Cyaxares II. Under the new dynasty Daniel was retained as the first of the three presidents appointed to rule over the whole kingdom; but this fresh exaltation brought Daniel very near to a violent death, for the nobles of Babylon, angry that a captive Jew should be set over them, determined on a speedy plot against his life, ending in a sentence of "The Jew to the lions," as was often heard afterwards at Rome, when the fierce cry of "The Christians to the lions" arose through the common hate of those unintelligible and inflexible Nazarenes, who despised *all* Gods but their own God—Christus. Daniel was now old, but his faith remained firm as ever, and this was greatly needed, when the king was induced by his treacherous nobles to sign a decree that none should worship any God for thirty days, on pain of being cast into a den of lions. The issue of this, has been plainly described in this morning's First Lesson; and although the king lamented over the result of his own decree, and tried all he could to save his valued minister, he felt compelled to pass sentence against Daniel for having *continued* to pray to his God, according to his constant custom, his only hope now being that *Daniel's God* would deliver him. Then, he was let down into that terrible pit, and its mouth was closed with a stone, sealed with the king's seal and the signets of his nobles. But *God's* seal was upon the holy captive, that the lions should not harm him; and His angel was with him all night, to shut their mouths, so that he could calmly and safely await the issue of this ordeal, whilst the hapless king in his palace, was passing a restless night of misery through self-reproach, and remorse. Then very early in the morning the king hurried off to the den's mouth, hoping, almost against hope, that his wise minister *might* be still living, and after the closing-stone had been raised, and he had said with a lamentable voice, "O Daniel, servant of the living God, *is* thy God, whom thou servest continually able to deliver thee from the lions?" To his great joy he heard an answer from the pit, and Daniel's voice, saying, "O king, live for ever. My God *hath* sent His angel and hath shut the lions' mouths, forasmuch as before Him innocency was found in me, and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt." Quickly and joyfully was he raised out of the pit, and then his base enemies were given to the lions, who immediately destroyed *them*, after which the one true God was exalted throughout the realm of Darius, as the living God, whose dominion shall be even unto the end, and Daniel prospered in his reign, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian.

Three distinct and precious lessons may be gathered from the history of Daniel.

I. The wisdom of abstinence from *excess* in early, as well as in after-life, debasing many through intemperance and impurity to the condition of a beast, although made after God's own image, and to whom He has given immortal souls. Never, never may any of you be tempted by the Devil to sully your early lives through impure words or acts, gluttony or drunkenness, remembering the future high and holy positions in the world to which at least some of you will be probably called: but above all remember your present election as sons of God, through Christ, in your trial for eternal life after death, and that you may come short of your heavenly inheritance.

II. Do not fail to mark the *danger* attending the good gift of *knowledge*, as exhibited by Daniel's history. "Get knowledge, get understanding," were the words of the wise Solomon, and you are here to do so, and *ought* to do so; yet even this good gift may bring evil with it, unless God's blessing leads you to use it aright. When I look back upon the past, I find it was not the cleverest boys, or those who as such acquired the most learning that have since invariably become the most

successful competitors in the race of after-life, first because intellectual powers grow and fade at very different periods of life, and then because many have sunk through the temptations to which the possession of superior talents have especially exposed them, and hence may bitterly say, with the fallen Solomon in his old age, "In much wisdom is much *grief*."

III. You cannot fail to see why Daniel, although severely tried, was always protected from imminent dangers, and greatly blest, viz., through his constant faith in God, and his unswerving obedience to His laws, even at the peril of his life. Honoured by two such great monarchs as Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, and saved in all times of emergency by his God, whom he served so well, his name is now doubtless sealed in heaven as a great prophet, and one of those very few holy men of old, of whom no fault is recorded in the Word of God.

Naturally you will seek to rise, as many of the preceding generations of Eton scholars have done, to high positions on earth, and some will doubtless succeed in this by attaining to the most exalted offices of England in Church and State; but the *best*—the *first* element of success—will be devotion to God, such as Daniel had in his youth, and throughout his life, accompanied by constant prayer for true wisdom and continual grace, enabling you to resist the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the Devil, that you may be blest on earth, and finally may attain unto everlasting life through Christ Jesus.

STONES CRYING OUT FOR THE CHURCH.

By the Ven.
T. B. BUCHANAN, M.A., Archdeacon of Wilts.

Sermon Preached in the Parish Church of Broad Hinton, Wilts., at its Re-opening after Restoration on All Saints' Day, 1880.

"I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out."—St. Luke xix. 40.

IT needs but a few words, my brethren, to recall to your minds the never-to-be-forgotten scene from which this text is taken. It was the first Palm Sunday, the day fixed from all eternity for the inauguration, the public proclamation, of the Kingdom of the Messiah; that visible but spiritual Kingdom which prophets of old had foretold, which the fore-runner had heralded, and which Jesus Christ Himself had but now announced as imminent. He came in lowly state to found this Kingdom,—His Eternal Church, the Church of the Living God (as His Apostle phrased it),—and to found it in His own Blood. It was a moment of transcendent importance in the history of the human race; and it was not fitting that it should pass unnoticed. Nor did it so pass. The recent magnificent miracle of the raising of Lazarus had deeply moved the popular mind. The unworthy efforts of the Pharisees to prevent Christ's coming to Jerusalem, and their determination to secure His person if He came, may not unnaturally have excited both indignation and pity. Partly doubtless from curiosity, and partly, it may be, from worthier motives, His visit to Jerusalem, at this last Passover had come to be eagerly looked for; and when, upon the destined morning, He took His seat upon the meek beast which prophecy had declared should be His Throne; and when the little band of His disciples, in their enthusiasm and devotion, strewed their garments as a royal carpet before Him, and lifted their voices in His honour; the crowd which had followed Him from Bethany caught the spark of their enthusiasm; a thousand hands imitated their actions, a thousand throats echoed their cries. Nay! the news of His triumphal progress preceded Him, and another band went forth from the city to meet Him. "And," we read, "the multitudes that went before and that followed cried saying Hosannah to the Son of David, blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Thus, contrary to all expectation, the lowly King was received with the highest honours, and the Kingdom He came to found was inaugurated with a pageant truly royal. But there were some, hard by, among the crowd, even now at the disciples' side to whom this great enthusiasm in His cause and the shouts that proclaimed His Kingdom were as gall and wormwood. It was not indeed that they objected to the foundation of a Kingdom, (to the Kingdom of the Messiah they had long looked forward), it was not even that they would not have acknowledged Him as the Messiah, and His Kingdom as that for which they had looked, (there are considerable traces of their hesitation on the point even to the very last); but it was that they could not bear to have the Kingdom ordered in any way but their own. His offence was that He would be independent, would depart from their preconceived notions, would order His Church, not after their fashion, nor the fashions of the kingdoms of the earth, but according to His own will; its greatness was to be the greatness of humility, and its rule was to be charity and blessing to all mankind, Because they could not endure this, therefore they rejected Him and It; and to see Him and It (as it seemed for the moment) triumphing, was bitterness unto them. Thus when the disciples and the multitudes "began to rejoice and to praise God with a loud voice, . . saying, blessed be the King that cometh in the Name of the Lord," they chose to denounce their cries as blasphemous, and, civilly ignoring the pretensions that warranted them, they came to Christ and said "Master, rebuke thy disciples." Our text records His answer, "I tell you, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out," No! they could not stop His destined triumph, nor the proclamation and onward progress of His Kingdom. It was the will of God, and they were powerless to prevent it; if they rebelled against it, if *men* could be persuaded to refuse Him the honour that was His due, Nature herself, even inanimate Nature, would find a voice to utter her protest; the very stones beneath their

feet, less stony than their own hard hearts, would immediately cry out.

But there may have been further depths in the Lord's utterance than this; who can doubt it as he remembers all the circumstances? It may well have been that while the expressive Jewish proverb was yet in His mouth, and He turned away from them, His enemies, to gaze and to weep over the glorious Temple and City which lay in the glitter of its marble and gold before Him, it may well have been that His thoughts were of the day when the multitudes around Him should indeed utter His praise no more; when they should utterly disown Him as their King, declaring in their abject degradation, that they had no King but Cæsar; when they should exchange their present voice of welcome for a shout of execration, and a cry for His blood, "Crucify Him, Crucify Him;" when the stones which echoed back their vacillation and their murderous ribaldry should make a silent but an eloquent protest for very shame. Nay, perhaps (who shall gainsay it?) He looked on further yet to the day when those majestic Temple stones should remain no more one stone upon another, and in that fall should proclaim aloud to every age the infatuation of their ruined nation, and the honour of their rejected Messiah. We must not, my brethren, speak positively of these things. In venturing to estimate the thoughts of our lowly King, we must not forget that He was the Most High God and we but dust and ashes; but when we observe that the special burst of praise which moved the Pharisees' indignation occurred "when He was come nigh even now at the descent of the Mount of Olives," and that it was "when He was come near" (apparently a little further on) that "He beheld the city, and wept over it," it is difficult to resist the conviction that His palpable rejection by His enemies now had called forth a thought of His coming universal rejection then, and brought clearly before His mind the doom that such rejection would bring to the nation He loved and would have saved; and if so, then certainly the stones He spake of were not those only which lay around their path, and which, if Abraham's children forgot their duty, might, at the bidding of the Almighty, arise to rebuke them; but those also which glittered in their pride before His eyes as He looked across the ravine of the Cedron at the majestic buildings before Him. Surely, though His ears were full of the applauding shouts, the cavillers' complaint was bringing a ghastly future to His mind, as He made answer to them thus, "I tell you that *if* these *should* hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out."

My brethren, it seems to me that we Churchmen who are gathered together in this House of God to-day, might perhaps, by His blessing, find somewhat of comfort and direction for ourselves under the guidance of this passage in our Master's history; and surely the most sanguine of us can hardly doubt that, in these days, we need both. My brethren, if our Lord could not *inaugurate* His Kingdom without cavil and opposition (arising, you observe, not from the utterly abandoned and profane, but from some of the most religious men of the day, as the Pharisees, with all their faults, undoubtedly were) if the first proclamation of the Kingdom could not take place without such men objecting and opposing, because the King would order it not in their way, but in his own;—do you wonder that the same kingdom, now fully ordered and settled, is still constantly provoking in its onward march throughout the ages, the cavil and the opposition of those (themselves oftentimes very religious men) who would fain have it ordered differently? So it has ever been, my brethren, through the eighteen centuries of this Kingdom's existence, and so it will surely be until the end. The form of the opposition to it will of course vary, in the different ages, according to the circumstances of the time. These Pharisees, *e.g.*, were apparently ready to acknowledge Christ as a great Teacher and Prophet—(of course they could know nothing as yet of Him as a Saviour)—but they would not receive Him at all as their King. Now all men will accept Him as the noblest of Teachers, most men will besides (though often apparently only for their own advantage), worship Him as Saviour and God; but how many refuse, just as the religionists of old, to acknowledge Him for their King? At any rate, if they acknowledge Him, it is but in words. They will not allow Him to *reign* over them. They will find a thousand ways to absolve themselves from allegiance to the Kingdom He set up. One principal way is to relegate it to dreamland; affect that it has no "local habitation and name;" resolve it into thin air; call it "invisible;" practically deny its existence; assert that our Lord never came to found a kingdom at all, if for a moment it attempts to place restrictions upon their thoughts, or to bind, in the slightest degree, their inclinations. In short, like the men of old, they will refuse allegiance, reject the Kingdom, because it is not ordered to their liking. If His disciples too loudly proclaim it, so forcibly as to arrest attention, they will resent it, rebuke and cavil; they will call them unreasonable or uncharitable; they will do their best to silence them; they will join the godless world in its fated opposition to them. My brethren, in days like these it is surely comfortable for us to dwell upon the rejoinder of the King Himself to those who cavilled at the setting up of His Kingdom of old. "If these should hold their peace" he said, "the stones will immediately cry out." Surely he makes known to us in these words the comparative unimportance of the efforts either of the enemies or of the supporters of His Kingdom. After all, if it is God's will, (and He has told us that it is His will) the Kingdom He has founded will *not* be overthrown by all the assaults of the gainsayers. Its onward progress may be checked, crippled, arrested for the moment here and there, but destroyed it cannot be, "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." And after all, on

the other hand, if the adverse efforts of its enemies be impotent, how insignificant also are the struggles of this or that generation of disciples in its defence! Its duration is fated, as truly as its foundation; and *then* our Saviour declared that, if its first proclaimers had been silenced, the very stones should immediately have cried out, Yes! our King is Lord over all creation. Nothing that the Universe can supply can be wanting to carry out His will. All Nature waits on His behest. In it there is and can be, but one rebel, the perverted will of man. If man yield to that perverted will, and sell (for a very mess of pottage) his birthright as the chief servant of the Almighty, think you that the Almighty should want a voice and an arm to work His will? Nay; the very poorest and meanest of His creatures should rise and protest against the blasphemy; the very stones of the hill-side should arise to do the work of Abraham's children. Courage, then, courage, the King Himself seems to say to all of us to-day, who are cast down by reason of the assaults,—the seemingly successful assaults,—which are made from time to time upon His Kingdom, the Church. Let us with confidence leave the matter in the Hands of the Lord of the Universe. The Kingdom that was inaugurated amid cavil and opposition does but proceed as it began. The circumstances of its proclamation were a prophecy of all its future here. Nor may we hope for peace until the day when it shall be consummated in glory. Ah! blessed day! for it not we alone, but all creation groans and waits, "waits" says the Apostle, "for the manifestation of the sons of God" "waits for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body;"—when the adoption which is ours now shall be manifested in its completeness before an assembled universe, when the pains nad aches of this carnal state of care and opposition shall pass away, and when, free and unfettered by sin and its consequences at last, the Church triumphant shall enter into the joy of its Lord. Nor can we forget, on such a day as this, that mighty army of Saints who already see it, and taste of it by anticipation, safe and at rest, the warfare over, the victory assured. Did not *they* come out of tribulation? And did not the very struggles that weigh us down vex their souls also? Yes! they have known it all, these blessed ones that are lying, in content unspeakable, on the bosom that was torn for them, and in tranquil security, adoring the Lamb, their King. Yes! they have known it all—the sickening apprehension of impending evil to the Church they have loved and lived for,—the crushing consciousness of their own powerlessness to resist it,—the heart-aching conviction that their own infirmities have deserved such evil and probably greatly exaggerated it,—they have known it all! And how speak they to us then this day, from their home of peace and joy? Do they not tell of courage, and of patience, and of faith, and of the eventual triumph of the truth? Do they not bid us leave it all, with a great security, to Him who knows the wants of His own Church, better than we can perceive them, and will make all things work together for its good? Do they not seem to stoop towards us from their place of rest this day, and to beckon us on to the same place whither our Saviour Christ is gone before? And if, at some moment of rebuke and depression, we be tempted to allow the voice of praise and thanksgiving before our King to be quenched in gloom, do not they (these living stones of the immaterial Temple,—at the other end of the Creation from those of which Christ spoke,—themselves the pledge and the earnest of that Creation's eventual freedom from corruption's bondage) do not they seem to take up the Apostolic cry, and say "seeing ye are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every weight, and the sin which does so easily beset you, and run with patience the race that is set before you; looking unto Jesus the Author and Finisher of your faith?"

There is one more application of our text to the special work of this day, which seems to me something more than fanciful. There can be little doubt, I presume, in the minds of those who estimate the times, that the current of popular events has cast something of a shadow over the future of these Houses of God. If the public convenience could be held to warrant so patent an injustice, involving so great a risk of desecration, as that which has recently been wrought in the yards of the Church, who shall venture to call it impossible that some similar measure might ere long be applied to the Churches themselves? In such a case it is difficult to understand how, on Church principles, houses which would then be at the disposal of all the forms of Schism and Heresy existing in the kingdom, could any longer be available for the worship of the Church. Unless some qualifications were possible which might save the consciences of Churchmen, I suppose the worship of the Church would largely cease in these time-honoured Houses of God. At any rate, with such possibilities in the future, it is perhaps no wonder that some hesitation should have been felt by Churchmen on the subject of Church-building or restoration. "If," they have said, "if it is so very easy for a vote or two in such a heterogeneous assembly as our House of Commons, to transfer our consecrated and sacred possessions to purposes other than those for which they were given, and of which we conscientiously disapprove, is it wise and is it right to lavish our best and choicest gifts upon these houses of God, which may hereafter possibly be treated in the same manner? Does our duty demand it, or the honour of our King require it?" My brethren, I have no hesitation in answering that question;—and I say His honour *does* require it, and does require it especially because of the doubt and difficulties which surround our action. See, my brethren, you can make your King a more grateful offering than of old; you can more clearly prove your trust and affiance in Him. In days of old, when the national guarantee remained unbroken, we had security, or

thought we had security, that the gifts we gave, under the sanction of the legislature, should be used for the objects for which we gave them. We cannot feel that we have such security now. But we know that our King is Lord over all, and can influence the passions and the intellects of men even as He will. We put our offering then in His Hand and leave it there. Yes! we can write our trust in our King on every stone we lay in the Great Triune Name. Nay! we can bequeath the history of our trust and our affiance to future ages! We can invest these Houses which we build and restore, with a message, with an appeal, which, whatever shall be their fate, shall survive as long as the fabric shall last. They shall tell us as long as they exist of the Churchman's God, the Living God, the Blessed Trinity in Unity, and how he worshipped Him. If he should ever be directly or indirectly silenced in the House of God he has loved and adorned, then the stones which he has left behind shall immediately cry out. They shall tell of the full adoration he has paid to his Saviour and his King, and of the decent and Catholic worship he has offered Him. The House shall be for ever a House plainly differenced from all ordinary houses—"exceedingly magnifical" according to our means both in its proportions and its furniture,—proclaiming itself, by its very appearance, the earthly Presence Chamber of the Lord of Hosts, and not the mere meeting place of mortal men,—meet for the worship of the Church of God and no other. The Cross on which the Saviour lay and hung, shall be built into its very foundations, and flash as a banner from every gable. The Altar-table in the east shall proclaim the reality of Christ's Presence, the perfectness of His Sacrifice, the plentitude of His Grace. The Font at the door shall assert the corruption of the human heart, and the method He appointed for its deliverance and union with Himself. The Tower shall assert His sovereignty over all other houses and all other kingdoms; and the strength and permanence of His sovereign rule. The Arches shall maintain the unity and stability of His Church, whose apparent earthly divisions meet ever in Heaven and Him. Not a trefoil in window, or on corbel but shall proclaim the mystery of His Triune Majesty, and call the beholder to worship the God of the Church, the Triune God. O! if these walls (the Lord avert it) shall ever echo to a false, or a mutilated or a perverted Gospel, the stones themselves shall cry out for the honour of our King and the full truth He brought. No! we will not hold our hand or stint our gifts. All we have and can, spite of the threats and devices of men, we will lay it at His feet; and He shall do with it what He will.

My brethren, once more as the years roll on, He seems to pass by us on His triumphal progress. He comes, He comes this day, attended by ten thousand of His Saints, the glorified subjects of the kingdom He founded on that first Palm Sunday—those that have been gathered from the East and the West and the North and the South in all the centuries of His Church. Lo! His train waxes large, as it sweeps by us in the House of God, the meeting-place here on earth of the spiritual and the material world our King and all His subjects, the saints in Paradise and those on earth, for all are one in Him. Let us arise to praise Him with them. Let us thus practically proclaim the supremacy of His kingdom and service in this parish and in this land. Let us thank Him for all the mercies He has wrought for both in the centuries past, blessed gifts of healing and of grace imitating in the spiritual world that raising of Lazarus and the rest which had stirred the thousands of Jerusalem. In this His Presence-Chamber, where He holds His Sovereign Court among us, let us dedicate ourselves afresh to His service, and raise a true Hosannah to His name; and if any voices of cavil or of menace seem to reach us from those who would fain order His Kingdom in some other way than His own, let us remember that our King is Lord not of His own spiritual Kingdom only, but of all the Universe as well. The resources of all creation are at His disposal. Out of the very stones around us, aye, harder still, out of the stony hearts of men, He can frame if He will the true children of the faithful Abraham, to render Him a full and entire obedience. Once more then courage, let us leave in His hands the care of His own Kingdom, the Church. With upraised hearts let us add our voices to the thousand times ten thousands, and thousands of thousands, that magnify Him in earth and Paradise and Heaven to-day, and so let us gather round His Holy Table where He will meet us with His right Hand full of gifts, recognizing us as His subjects, fastening us anew unto Himself, yea! feeding us with His own Body and Blood, from which, as of old, all virtues issue, and strengthening us to endure until the end. In such a spirit make your offering of person, and praise, and substance this day, and hail your King with a trustful and devoted heart, convinced that spite of all "His judgments are everlasting and of His Kingdom there shall be no end."

"Praise the Lord, O my soul, while I live will I praise the Lord, yea, as long as I have any being, I will sing praises unto my King. O put not your trust in princes nor in any child of man for there is no help in them. Blessed be He that hath the God of Jacob for His help; and whose hope is in the Lord His God."

On Saturday, the 30th ult., the Bishop of Rochester consecrated the church of St. Paul's, Kingston Hill. The population of the district numbers more than 6,000, having doubled itself within the last ten years. In the first instance an iron chapel was provided, for which three years ago the present church was substituted and opened by license. The altar was exhibited at the Croydon Church Congress, and is a gift "in memory of a beloved husband." During the last nine years nearly £9,000 had been spent upon the Church work of the district. The patronage is vested in the Bishop of Rochester, Canons Garbett and Richardson, the Rev. E. Holland, and Sir H. Peek; and the vicar-designate is the Rev. A. Cornford.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY NOVEMBER 20, 1880.

THE Venerable Archdeacon Buchanan has preached an able and most opportune Sermon, which, as requested, he has fortunately enabled us to print. It is a sermon that should be read by all, whether Laymen or Clergymen, who are depressed and despondent as to the future *status* of the National Church owing to the recent Burials Act. We have always thought that Act calculated rather to strengthen than to weaken the Church's hold on the affections of the people; but hundreds of excellent Churchmen have taken the opposite view, and it is to them that we commend this Sermon of resignation and hope, and bid them with the eloquent preacher to take courage. Many of these gentlemen have declined to subscribe to the "Wordsworth Memorial" Fund for increasing the "Southwell Bishopric Endowment;" because they fear that the Legislature may some day confiscate it. We hope this Sermon may change their minds, and induce them not only to subscribe, but to attend the Public Meeting for promoting these very worthy objects, which is advertised to be held on Thursday next, the 25th inst., at the National Society's Room.

THE SITUATION IN IRELAND.—II.

History is repeating itself in Ireland. There has been the usual course of unchecked agitation; but at length the Government have begun to lay to their hand, and the leaders of the movement are to be prosecuted. In the meantime, however, immense mischief has been done; and if any legislation in the direction of the tenants is effected in the next session of Parliament, it will be attributed by the Home Rule party entirely to the unworthy motive of fear. Political changes in Ireland have three features, viz.:—agitation, repression, concession. First, agitation of the question; then repression of the agitators and their followers; lastly, concession in a greater or less degree to their demands. At present, the Irish land question is entering the second of these stages, as a tardy attempt is now being made at repression of the agitators. It was foreseen by some at the time that the attack on the temporalities of the Irish Church would be followed by an attack on the Irish landlords, and the foreboding has been justified. Whether the Home Rulers and Land Leaguers also have it distinctly in contemplation or not, there can be doubt that the present agitation is a second blow struck at the Irish Church. Most of the Irish landlords are her members, and in some places in the south and west of Ireland, the sustentation of the Church depends on the offerings of the landed gentry; it is easy to see therefore, that, if they are seriously crippled or bought up, the result to the Church in those districts will be very serious. It would in fact amount to the drying of it up in certain parishes. The writer knows of a case in which one Protestant landlord, of what would be considered moderate means in England, has lost, it is stated, £800 within the last year or so. Having received no rent from one tenant in particular for three years, he at last was obliged to eject him; the farm was let to another tenant, but within a week the house on it was burnt down. Reference was made in a former article to the practice of hiring persons for the purpose of intimidation and assassination, and the writer was lately informed by a friend just returned from a tour in the West of Ireland, that, while staying there in the house of a stipendiary magistrate, the latter showed him a list of nine persons, who were under police protection, in consequence of information received that they had all been marked off to be murdered, the assassins being already hired and "paid for the job." The state of suspense in which some such threatened men live must be terrible. Some time since the writer visited a friend, an Irish agent, and on sitting down by an open window in front of the room, which was used as an office, was quietly but very significantly pulled back. Not long before an attempt had been made to shoot this agent, while he was walking in the grounds. At this time he had a revolver beside him on his desk. When we passed into another room, a double-barrelled gun was visible, ready for use, and upon a cupboard being opened to procure materials for lunch, a brace of pistols were to be seen therein, though it was such an unlikely corner for an armoury. A second desperate attempt was afterwards made to shoot this gentleman, which resulted in the murder of his coachman. One of the band of assassins was happily captured, and died on the gallows. We do not pretend to justify all and everything connected with Landlordism, but is it right to allow an indiscriminate sale and possession of arms, when such deeds are but, alas, too common in Ireland? Irishmen, as a rule, are kind-hearted and genial, and much influenced by personal attachment; and surely, this terrible blood-stain is not ineradicable.

> Tall is his form, his heart is warm,
> His spirit light as any fairy;
> His wrath is fearful as the storm
> That sweeps the hills of Tipperary.

A strong hand is needed to guide the fortunes of the country at the present time. One good result of the present prosecutions will probably be that there will henceforth be a decided break between Liberals and Home Rulers; and the sooner coquetting for the Irish vote is ended the better. Mr. Gladstone may attribute the present disturbed state of Ireland to the rejection of his Disturbance Bill; but it is to be hoped that he will not permit any personal pique caused by the rejection of that measure to prevent the necessary steps being taken for the protection of life and property; until the whole land question is re-opened in Parliament. The personal equation, as it is called, is no small factor even in great matters. A witty Irish lady,

regarding the subject from her own point of view, has aptly described the Premier himself as the "Disturbance Bill" of Ireland.

POSITIVISM: ITS SOCIAL AND MORAL TENDENCIES.

By the Rev. BROWNLOW MAITLAND., M.A., of Montagu Square, London.

We are engaged in examining certain systems of doctrine which have been propounded in the place of Christianity for the regulation of human life. In regard of all such systems it appears to me that we have to ask two plain questions in order to arrive at a correct estimate of their practical merits and probable consequences. First, whether they set before us an adequate standard of conduct; and secondly, whether they furnish a sufficient motive force to enable us to realise the standard in our own lives. What, then, I propose to do in the few minutes allotted to me is to put these questions very briefly to Positivism, which strikes me as the most interesting and attractive, as well as the best defined, of the systems under our consideration: to ask whether, as a moral system, it satisfies the two requirements, of a just standard, and a sufficient working force? Now, in respect of the former of these requirements, I have no complaint to make of Positivism. Its rule of conduct is a very elevated one, and may fairly be considered identical with the law of human morality propounded in the Gospel. According to Comte the love of humanity constitutes all sound morality, and to live for others ought to be the sovereign law and supreme happiness of everyone. The professed aim of Positivism is to eradicate selfishness and promote universal brotherhood; or, in its own technical phraseology, to subordinate the egotistic desires to the altruistic, and to produce harmony between the individual and the race. It urges us to regard all things from the social point of view, and to shape our lives so as to help others as much as we can to fulfil their proper functions. Among the qualifications for acting rightly it reckons tenderness and energy as the most important; man is always to be turning his faculties to account, but all his activities are to be animated by benevolence and directed to promote the welfare of his fellow-men. Such is the canon of ethics which Positivism sets before us, and it is not for Christians to deny its legitimacy or its beauty. For the Gospel itself lays the foundation of morals in the nature of man, brands selfishness as the root of all wrong-doing, and glorifies the rule of living for others—the law of self-sacrifice—as the universal principle of right conduct. Pointing us to the Divine Son of Man, it exhorts us to have the mind which was in Him, who pleased not Himself, and came to serve and to give His very life for others. Hence I do not feel I have any right to bring against Positivism the charge of propounding an inadequate or unworthy standard of morals. But passing from the rule or canon to the working force of morality, the case seems to me to be completely altered. According to Christianity, goodness has at its back the most powerful motives by which a moral agent can be influenced. On its side is ranged the Almighty Father and Lord, in whose universe the righteous can neither perish nor lose their reward. It is sustained by the sympathy and grace of the Father's Son, who unites Himself to every true-hearted follower in the path of self-sacrifice, and draws the will by the bonds of His love. It has before it an eternity of life in which to ripen its fruits of endless joy. To the force of these motives there is no limit except the limit of the faith through which their constraining influence is exerted. But in Posivitism none of these has any place. It acknowledges no righteous Father above all, no Divine Brother with all, no eternal life in which the triumph of goodness may be perfected. Without a God, without a Heaven, without a divine spirit of holiness, without a life to come, it shuts up man within his physical environment, and leaves him entirely dependent on what he finds there for the sustaining impulse of goodness. Thus left alone with Nature and with the doom of a speedy annihilation upon us, we ask Posivitism what force it can supply to overcome the ingrained selfishness of the human heart, and constrain us for our little day to live lives of glorious self-sacrifice. For answer it directs us to what it calls Humanity, spelling the word with a capital initial, as if to make it convey the notion of an actual living being. This humanity is held up before us as the Supreme Existence, the most real and living of all known beings, the majestic parent of us all; and we are assured tha the steady contemplation of this Great Being will eradicate selfishness, exalt and purify all our sentiments, and ennoble and consolidate all our actions. In a word, gazing with the mind's eye on humanity we shall be transformed into children of light. Well, but we want to know a little more about the object which is to exert so mighty an influence upon us. What, in sober fact, is this humanity? It must, we suppose, be something more than the mere aggregate of living men and women; for, however interesting these may be, they certainly do not constitute an awful object of worship, nor do they stand to us in the relation of majestic fatherhood. And we are so far right; the humanity which is the supreme being of Positivism is by no means limited to the living members of the human family. It embraces the whole race past, present, and future; the dead who have vanished into nothingness, and the unborn who as yet are not, as well as the existing occupants of the earth. It is the race in its totality, and not the individuals; the organization which developes itself in the successive generations of mankind, and of which each human being may be termed the symbol and offspring. But if so, then to speak of this humanity as in itself a real Being is only to juggle with words. It is a mere mental abstraction or generalization—a poetical personification or figure—which possesses no objective reality, no actual existence outside our own thought. Like all generic names, it expresses a conception; but life, individuality, substance, being, it has none. Now, I do not understand why this ideal humanity, however dressed up by an imposing rhetoric, should constrain us to the life of self-sacrifice. Our living, breathing fellow-creatures appeal directly to our sympathies. We look on their faces, we realise their wants and sorrows, we feel their brotherhood with us. "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin." But this bodiless phantom, this metaphysical abstraction, which never did exist, and never can exist except in the imagination of philosopher or poet, lies altogether outside of our practical life, says nothing to our hearts, excites no sympathy, stirs no emotion, constrains to no self-sacrifice for its sake. It may be a convenient figure for representing our fellow-men to our minds as a united whole, but it adds nothing to the actual fact. Why should anyone be more inclined to do for its sake what he cares not to do for the sake of his actual flesh-and-blood brethren who need his help? Surely the motive force is all on the side of the real. If a man love not his brother whom he hath seen, how shall he

love this impalpable humanity which he hath not seen and never can see? Were there, indeed, no volcanic passions in the world, no idolatry of self, no unscrupulous ambition or imperious self-will, this dream of regenerating mankind by the worship of an ideal humanity might perhaps be somewhat less visionary; but as things are it is only fit for the philosopher's closet, where it first took shape. Let his disciples bring out their high-sounding phrase into the rough ways of human life, and try in earnest to adjure by it the turbulent demons of pride and selfishness and sensuality, which disorganise society and stain the world with vice and crime, and I much fear that it would fare no better with them than with those baffled exorcists of old, whom the demoniac drove out with the scornful cry, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?" No, my Lord Bishop. While I freely confess the excellence of the moral code of Positivism and admire the courage of its adherents in endeavouring to improve a race which they suppose left to do battle with evil without help and without hope, I cannot discover in it any working force sufficient to overcome the many attractions of a life of self-indulgence. It reminds me of a piece of machinery, which looks beautiful in a drawing, but when brought to trial will not work. The inertia, the friction, the resistance of the real world are too much for it. It is a pretty enough theory, this evolution of universal unselfishness by the worship of an ideal humanity, but under the strain of passion and egotism it must break down at the first attempt to apply it. What is this sublimated abstraction to me, the self-seeking heart will demand, that I should sacrifice for it the few short-lived joys that are my all? And the question is unanswerable.

> Live while you live, the epicure would say,
> And snatch the pleasures of the passing day.

"Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." But while we condemn Positivism for its moral weakness, I think that we Christians have a very serious lesson to learn from it. Why should there have been room for this novel scheme for purging the world from selfishness and uniting mankind in a fair brotherhood, in which each should look not on his own things but on the things of others, seeing that the Christian Church has for more than eighteen centuries professed the like aim? Why? rejoins the Positivist, because the Church has failed. With all its supernatural mysteries and dogmas, its Heaven and its hell, it has found human nature too stubborn and perverse for it, and the result is this chaotic Christendom, nation armed against nation, class arrayed against class, anarchy, fraud, and vice everywhere pervading and breaking up the social fabric. Alas, that there should be so much truth in the retort; that, with all our advantages, so little deliverance should have been wrought by us in the earth. Perhaps we have not been faithful enough to the Spirit of Christ, and have too little remembered that true Christianity is not so much a system of dogma and ritual as a new life in the Father and the Son—a life of holy sympathy and unselfish service. It may be that we have shown ourselves too jealous of what we deem our rights, too oblivious of morality in our zeal for orthodoxy, too suspicious and contentious among ourselves instead of being united, heart and soul, to conquer the world for Christ by patience and love. Yet there is everything to hope, if the Church will but exhibit a large and generous sympathy with the wants and aspirations of this stirring age. She has the promise of the very consummation which men blindly seek, in their craving for a fuller unity, and their dream of a coming kingdom of man. For hers is the mission to prepare the way for that true kingdom of redeemed humanity which rests on the Father's love, is constituted in the divine Son of Man, and is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE "WORDSWORTH AND SOUTHWELL" FUNDS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Last month you were good enough to insert in your columns the Circular Letter issued by our Committee to the subscribers to the Memorial to the noble-minded Bishop of Lincoln.

I beg now to make a further request for permission to call the attention of your readers to an announcement which appears in another part of your columns, of a public meeting of subscribers, etc., to be shortly held, by permission, for the purpose of giving the subporters of the movement an opportunity of adopting the report which will then be presented by the Committee. I may be allowed to say that this report will be supported by speakers whose names have not appeared on the list of the Committee, in order to afford others, and especially the Laity, an occasion of testifying their respect for the Bishop of Lincoln, and thereby to show that the disposition to honour him so signally evoked by his lordship's recent action, is not confined to the class more especially affected by certain legislative innovations.

Your readers will find on the second page of your last issue the list of subscribers down to the 9th ultimo. The present announcement carries the Fund down to the date of this letter, about eleven weeks since the first subscription was received, the total representing subscriptions varying from 2s. 6d. to £25 from 231 persons; yielding a weekly average of £25 from 21 persons.

In the terms of the Report:—"The Fund is chiefly made up of numerous small sums from those desiring to testify their admiration of Bishop Wordsworth's firm conduct with respect to the Burials Act; who wish to place that sum at his disposal towards the See of Southwell Fund, or as his lordship may determine."

At the Public Meeting on the 25th inst., it is proposed to close the Subscription List; the movement having answered most successfully and satisfactorily the end for which it was originated, viz., to demonstrate—

1. That the Clergy are not ungrateful for the defence of their interests and the rights of the Church.

2. That the Laity are far from indifferent to the welfare of an institution the history of which is really the "History of England," down to modern times.

3. That assaults upon the Church tend to make both Clergy and Laity prize more and more the privileges and benefits which that institution has been the means of conferring both nationally and individually, and therefore upon the Nation itself.

G. E. WATKINS, Hon. Sec.

Stamford-le-Hope, Romford,
Nov. 9, 1880.

BAPTISM.

SIR,—In reply to your correspondent, "H. S. G.," I should say there was little doubt on the whole that the words "by water" in the first prayer in the Office for Holy Baptism are to be connected with "perishing,"

and not with "save." For this reason, Noah and his family were not saved by water, but from perishing by water. It is true that he was saved by water in the sense that the ark was floated by the water, but is not this a little forced? The ark was the real means of his salvation after all, and not the water, for had there been no water there would have been no danger.

The flood was the manifestation of God's wrath against evil-doers, and the waters of the Red Sea were the instrument of God's vengeance on the oppressors of the chosen people.

In both cases it was from being overwhelmed and *perishing by water* that God's people were saved.

November 15th, 1880. C. S. BOOTY.

—— : o : ——

THE DEITY OF CHRIST PROVED FROM JOHN 14. 28. " . . . MY FATHER IS GREATER THAN I."

This is a favourite passage with Unitarians, who constantly refer to it as an argument against the true Deity of Christ, but they invariably refer to it as if it was a substantive and independent statement, whereas it is evident from its being connected with the preceding part of the verse by the word "for" that it is a subordinate part of the entire verse in which it occurs, so that its meaning is qualified and determined by the words going before. The complete statement is as follows:—"If ye loved Me ye would rejoice because I said 'I go unto My Father,' for My Father is greater than I." Now to explain this passage it is necessary to observe that Christ does not say "My Father *was* greater than I" in reference to His pre-existent glory; nor does He say "My Father *wil. be* greater than I" in reference to the glory which He was to resume after His exaltation; but He uses a style of expression which refers to the *present* time, or to the time of His humiliation upon earth—"for My Father *is* greater than I." The Apostles had evidently been manifesting sorrow and regret at the announcement of His approaching departure (John 14. 1.), and this passage contains a gentle and indirect reproof of the selfishness of their feelings. We may paraphrase it thus:—"If ye really loved Me on My own account, if the regard and affection which you profess to entertain towards Me were purely disinterested in its nature, so far from evincing sorrow at the prospect of My departure ye would rejoice that I shall leave this state of temporary degradation, that I shall cease to be the Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief, and that I shall go unto the Father and resume that original and essential glory which I enjoyed with Him from all eternity; *for* as long as I continue in My present state of humiliation, My Father *is* greater in glory than I, but when the days of My present tabernacling in the flesh shall terminate, I shall then be exalted to the right hand of My Father, and be glorified with His Own Self with the glory which I had with Him before the world was" (Acts 5. 31; John 17. 5). This I maintain to be the correct meaning of the passage, for no other interpretation of the words—"for My Father is greater than I"—could justify, or attach any force to, the interesting appeal which the Saviour makes to the love and affection of His Disciples. This text, therefore, so far from being an objection against the Deity of Christ and His co-ordinate dignity with the Father, when rightly understood affords an unanswerable argument in support of that doctrine.—*From the last speech of Dean Bagot on the third day of the Belfast Unitarian Discussion, page* 240.

Professor C. J. Plumptre's introductory Lecture at King's College, London, on "The Expression of the Emotions by Language" is well worth perusal by every public speaker. After explaining that by language he means the various inflections, modulation, poise, emphasis, and other elements that give life and soul to words, he adds: "Words alone cannot convey emotion. Where can be found words more solemn than those in which the supplications in our English Liturgy are clothed? And yet is it so very rare a thing to hear these supplications so read in our Churches as to arouse scarcely any responsive feeling of solemnity or prayer? As if indeed it were a mere perfunctory task, a duty which has to be done, and so long as it is done, it matters little how it is done. What, I ask with all respect, is the use of a Liturgy at all? If sung, chanted, or intoned, I suppose the answer will be to produce a devotional emotion in the minds of the congregation by the aid of these musical elements of expression; and if these results are produced by these means, and far be it from me to deny that in many cases, and perhaps an increasing number, as our æsthetic sensibilities are more and more developed, then the answer is sufficient; and though the *words* of the prayers, perchance, may not be so well heard, yet a deeply devotional *feeling* may be produced, just as Mendelssohn has shown us in those exquisite compositions of his entitled 'Songs without Words,' what emotions and sentiments may be produced in our minds by music alone; so I can imagine in like manner by the aid of sacred songs or chants, a deeply devotional feeling is produced, and I for one can quite realise as much to myself the idea of a 'Prayer without Words,' as of a 'Song without Words.' But when in our churches, chapels, schools, and families prayers are *read*, the case is very different; and again I venture, with all respect, to ask, what is the object of having our prayers read? Certainly one *main* object must be to impress upon the minds of all who hear them a sense of the deep devotional feelings which prompts their utterances, of the solemn nature of the words in which their supplications are embodied, and of the Being to whom they are offered; for I can hardly imagine that in these days there can be any one present who entertains such an anthropomorphic idea as to think it necessary that our feelings and supplications must first be clothed in human, articulate language before they can become known to God. If then we hear these prayers read so as to produce no impression on a congregation or family, or indeed it may be from the utter incongruity between the solemn words of the prayer and the voice and manner with which it is read, producing an impression the very opposite to that which should be produced, can we wonder, to quote the very words of an eminent Divine (the Rev. C. Simeon), 'that we so often hear the Prayers of the Church spoiled, and sermons, good in matter it may be, rendered uninteresting by bad delivery on the part of ministers.' Again, take the reading of the Lessons and the preaching of the Sermon. Is there to be no emotion here? Where can we find passages characterised by more sublimity, beauty, pathos, or tenderness than we have in the lessons selected for our services, where characters more varied introduced, where feelings, sentiments, and emotions more comprehensive in their range, or more powerfully expressed in words? If I were asked in what two books are the magnificence, the wonderful expressiveness, and power of our Anglo-Saxon tongue most displayed, I should answer, in our English translation of the Bible, and in Shakespeare.

And how do we hear the Lessons from our Bible read in general? What is the object of these Lessons? I can imagine but one real sound efficient answer can be given, and that is, to make the hearers thoroughly feel the truths uttered, the sentiments expressed, and the emotions that are conveyed, and this cannot be done by the mere utterance of words, however powerful may be the ideas of which words are the outward symbols. These are not the views entertained by laymen only. Here is the opinion of a distinguished clerical writer in *The Contemporary Review*, October, 1872, who in an excellent article entitled *The Ethics of Ritual*, writes thus—'The readings from the Bible require much thought and much knowledge . . . and much may be done by an intelligent and cultivated reader to enforce the meaning of what he reads by proper variation of tone, pause, and emphasis. Such semi-dramatic seems almost indispensible if the minds of the careless or the uneducated are to be reached, and for their sakes, at any rate, we much regret the prevalent use of the monotone in reading the Lessons in our ritualistic churches.'"

The church of St. Stephen, Edge-hill, Liverpool, is in course of removal from one side of the street to another for a railway improvement.

The Bishop of London has licensed the chapel of Trinity College, London, and has appointed as the first chaplain thereof the Rev. H. G. Bonavia Hunt, one of the honorary officers of the college.

The *Record* states that the vacancy in the honorary secretariat of the Church Home Mission, caused by the removal of the Rev. Edward Auriol, has been filled by the election of Prebendary Cadman, rector of Holy Trinity, Marylebone.

The *Carlisle Journal* announces that Dean Close is about to be married to Mrs. Hodgson, relict of Mr. David Hodgson, of Scotty and Liverpool. It is added that the Dean, though in hiseighty-fourth year, is still comparatively hale and hearty.

We are authorised to state that the living of Whitechapel has been offered by the Bishop of Bedford to the Rev. A. J. Robinson, of St. John's, Waterloo-bridge-road. Mr. Robinson has been lately offered Ramsgate by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Shoreditch by Bishop Claughton.

The Public Oratorship.—The Rev. W. W. Merry, M.A., Fellow and Classical Lecturer of Lincoln College, is announced as a candidate for the office of Public Orator in the University, vacant by the death of Mr. T. F. Dallin. The Public Orator must be a member of Convocation, and he is elected by that body.

The *Durham Advertiser* states that Mr. Ground, who has been for some years a Congregation l minister has been promised ordinations by Bishop Lightfoot.

Before leaving office, the ex-Lord Mayor (Sir F. Truscott) forwarded to the Lord-Lieutenant of Cornwall £1,085, which has been collected at the Mansion-house for the Truro Cathedral Fund.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has collated the Rev. Charles Edward Shirley, Woolmer, vicar of Deal, to the vicarage of Ramsgate, vacant by the preferment of the Rev. R. Elwyn. Mr. Woolmer graduated in honours at Exeter College, Oxford, where he was Reynolds and Acland Exhibitioner in 1841, and he was some twenty years ago curate of Ramsgate. Mr. Woolmer was ordained in 1852 by the Bishop of Manchester to the curacy of Bolton-le-Moors. He is the author of "Letters on Ritualism," "Wesleyanism," "The Law of Sacrifice," "The Shadow and the Very Image."

Diocesan Conferences.—The Bishop of Rochester, in a pastoral letter just issued to his clergy, says that Diocesan Conferences have now passed out of the region of experiment into that of recognised advantage, and that to presume to plead for them would be an impertinence. But he points out the value of Conferences as preventing the entire absorption of energies within a limited area, and says that in the larger and fresher air of the diocese frank speech, kindly toleration, quiet self-respect, bright good humour, and simple devoutness might be of general use. No diocese, owing to its vast and heterogenous character, needs such Conferences so much as that of Rochester.

The Rev. W. P. Cay Adams, vicar of St. Paul's, Lorrimore-square, died rather suddenly on Saturday evening. He had been in bad health for some time, but continued his pastoral duties until Thursday last, when he was seized with a bronchial attack, subsequently developing into congestion of the lungs. He graduated in 1869 at Exeter College, where he took a First Class in Law. He was ordained the next year by the Bishop of Oxford, and in 1873 was appointed rector of Hawkchurch, Dorset, from which he exchanged in 1878 with the Rev. J. Going.

The resolution which was passed by the Winchester Diocesan Conference after Mr. Few's paper, and after addresses in its support by General Lewis, Canons Hoste, Wilson, and Ernest Wilberforce, and the Rev. Edgar Jacob, was as follows:—"That, in the opinion of this conference, it is desirable to take special steps to meet the infidelity and indifference to religion prevalent in the present day; and that the Right Rev. President be requested to nominate a committee of clergy and laity to take into consideration the measures best fitted to attain that end, and especially amongst the large masses of the artisan and humbler classes in our great cities and towns, with power to at once carry into execution the measures so to be recommended if approved by the President."

In accordance with ancient custom a service was held on Wednesday, at St. Mary-le-Bow, Cheapside, to commemorate the accession of Queen Elizabeth, funds having been provided for that purpose in the wills of the late Mr. Chapman and others. An address was delivered by the Rev. F. T. Elme, B.A., vicar of Patrixbourne, Kent, who took for his text Joshua xxiv. 15, "But as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." He said he had chosen that pious resolve of Joshua for his text because it was uttered in later times, with very similar results by one who, like Joshua, led the people in the paths of truth and righteousness, and whose accession to the throne they were met to celebrate that morning. Elizabeth, becoming firmly attached to the reformed faith, determined to put away, as Joshua had done, the false gods, the idolatrous and superstitious rites of Rome, which had led to such disastrous results, deluging the country with the blood of martyrs. In the present day, when there was a great tendency in some quarters to throw off the distinctively Protestant doctrines of our Church, it was right to remember that these were no mere excrescences, but the foundations on which our Church, as a national church, was raised. We owed to Elizabeth the establishment, or rather the re-establishment, of the Church and State, which had been such a blessing to both. Commerce, art, and literature flourished during the time of Elizabeth, but the great work of the Reformation exceeded all the other distinguished features of her reign.

The death of the Rev. Dr. Seymour, in his eighty-ninth year, has occurred at his residence, Warberry-hill, Weston-super-Mare. He was the father-in-law of Lord Coleridge, and the father of the Rev. Henry Fortescue Seymour, rector of Nettlecombe, near Taunton, formerly a Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, and for fifteen years vicar of Barking.

In the diocese of Salisbury a Special Missions Society has been formed under the presidency of the Bishop, Archdeacon Lear being Warden and Canon R. Smith Sub-Warden. Its object is to further the holding of special Missions on the invitation of the parish priest, and upon such plan as may seem to him expedient; but it recognises no basis of religious thought, practice, or union narrower than that of the Church of England. At this first Annual meeting there was a special celebration at the cathedral, after which a conference was held on the best methods of dealing with persons after a special Mission service. It commenced with the *Veni Creator*, the Nicene Creed, a short Scripture lection, and collects. Very able and interesting introductory papers were read by the Revs. E. E. Dugmore and H. C. Howard, followed by a discussion, in which most of the members present took part. At noon there was a short devotional Office, conducted by Canon Smith, the chairman. The business meeting of the society commenced at half-past twelve, when the report was read by Canon Codd, secretary, and was unanimously adopted by the meeting. The report shows that the society has on its roll ten experienced missioners and eighteen assistant-missioners. Several associates, who had fully intended being present, were prevented by the inclemency of the weather. It should, however, be added that one gentleman had come across Salisbury Plain on a bicycle—a distance of twenty-two miles—in order to be present at the early celebration.

———:o:———

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Abbey, Rev. Alfred James, perpetual curate of Marazion Chapel, Cornwall.
Adams, Rev. R., assistant-chaplain at St. Bartholomew's Hospital.
Atkens, Rev. Albert, chaplain Bath United Hospital.
Atkinson, Rev. Arthur, honorary canon of Chester Cathedral.
Bacon, Rev. James Henry, rector of Great Gonerby.
Baldwin, Rev. Octavius De Leyland, chaplain of the Chorley Union Workhouse.
Burnside, Rev. Henderson, senior curate of St. George's, Birmingham; curate-in-charge, St. Saviour's, Forest-gate, London.
Carr, Rev. William Henry, vicar of Kimberworth.
Chapman, Rev. George, minister of the District of the Annunciation, Brighton.
Chase, Rev. Charles Henry, vicar of Bishop's Lydeard.
Chatto, Rev. James Thomas Chipperfield, vicar of Stourton Caundle, Dorset.
Dodd, Rev. Henry Russell, honorary canon of Chester, Cathedral.
Estridge, Rev. Loraine, vicar of Lordsworth, Sussex.
Fertel, Rev. William Joseph, vicar of Willoughby-with-Wysall.
Fleming, Rev. Sidney Hall, rector of East Chinnock.
Forbes, Rev. Arthur Fraser, vicar of Matfen, Northumberland.
Foster, Rev. C. H., curate of Bonne Bay, Newfoundland.
Furley, Rev. Edward Mainwaring, perpetual curate of St. Matthew, Guernsey.
Garrett, Rev. William Whitehall, vicar of Cramlington, Northumberland.
Girling, Rev. John Colk, rector of Hautbois Magra; rector of Cottishall, Norfolk (the benefices having lately been united by an Order of her Majesty in Council).
Gretton, Rev. Henry, minister of the District of All Saints', Crowborough.
Grigson, Rev. Edward, pepertual curate of Rosliston.
Hall, Rev. Webster, rector of Dalby.
Hanbury, Rev. John, curate of West Malvern.
Hinde, Rev. C. L. M., vicar of Flockton-cum-Wenby Grange.
Hines, Rev. Rogers, vicar of Shepreth.
Hulme, Rev. James, perpetual curate of New District of Woodside.
Hunt, Rev. H. G. Bonavia, curate of Esher; chaplain of Trinity College, London.
Jenkins, Rev. John, vicar of Capel Curig.
Joy, Rev. Frederic Walter, curate of Crakehall.
Kelly, Rev. William Frederick, vicar of Lacey Green.
Loyd, Rev. Lewis Haig, vicar of St. Lawrence, Northampton.
Mason, Rev. John Williams, rector of Meldon, Northumberland.
Morgan, Rev. John, rector of Trefdraeth.
Moxon, Rev. George Henry, chaplain of the Guild Chapel, Stratford-on-Avon.
Osborne, Rev. Henry Trimmer, vicar of Riseley.
Paine, Rev. Jesse, perpetual curate of Rowton.
Payne, Rev. C. L., chaplain at St. Pierre, Miquelon, Newfoundland.
Pennington, Rev. P., vicar of Bolton, Westmoreland.
Phillips, Rev. John William Heigham, rector of Little Whelnetham.
Piggott, Rev. Thomas, minister of St. Stephen, Upper Holloway.
Pryce, Rev. John, vicar of Bangor, Carnarvonshire.
Pudsey, Rev. Charles Douglas, perpetual curate of Newton-on-Rawcliffe.
Riddle, Rev. A. E., perpetual curate of Rydal, Westmoreland.
Riley, Rev. Henry F., curate of St. James's, Hereford.
Roberts, Rev. Edward Dale, minister of the New Church of St. Paul, Lozells.
Robins, Rev. George Augustus, rector of Eccleston.
Ruxton, Rev. Augustus Frederick Dashwood, curate of Well.
Sanderson, Rev. J. S., missionary at Random, Newfoundland.
Saxby, Rev. G. F., curate of Upton Scudamore; curate-in-charge of Felton, and Long Framlington, Northumberland.
Smith, Rev. C. E., curate of Harbour Grace, Newfoundland.
Smith, Rev. Edward Snowden, rector of St. Mary's, Wavertree.
Spencer, Rev. Walter, vicar of Sapiston.
Temple, Rev. J. W., S.P.G. missionary, White Bay, Newfoundland.
Tew, Rev. E. L. H., vicar of Hornsea and rector of Long Riston; provincial grand chaplain of the Freemasons of North and East Yorkshire.
Upperton, Rev. Charles Stuart, honorary canon of Chester.
Wade, Rev. Frederick, prebendary of Lichfield, vicar of Kidsgrove; rector of Tatenhill.
Walker, Rev. Alfred Montague, curate of St. Luke, Berwick-street, W.; rector of St. Stephen's, near San Fernando, Trinidad, W.I.
Walker, Rev. Augustine Harley, perpetual curate of Kingskerswell.
Walker, Rev. John, rector of Whalton.
Whiteley, Rev. Charles Edward, chaplain at Madras.
Wilkie, Rev. David, assistant-chaplain, Rue D'Aguesseau, Paris.
Wilson, Rev. E. N, curate of All Hallows', Barking, and early Sunday morning lecturer at St. Swithin's, Cannon-street; vicar of St. Paul, Southwark.
Wilson, Rev. Robert Wetherall, perpetual curate of Shotley, Northumberland.
Woolmer, Rev. C. E. Shirley, vicar of Deal, vicar of Ramsgate.
Young, Rev. William Frederick, curate of Edlington.

———:o:———

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Adams, William Pigott Cay, at the Vicarage, Lorrimore-square, priest, and vicar of St. Paul's, Walworth, formerly rector of Hawkchurch, Dorset, and son of the late Rev. Edward Cay Adams, on the 13th inst.
Fyler, Rev. Samuel Arnot, rector of Cornhill-on-Tweed, Northumberland, on the 2nd inst.
Shortland, Ven. Archdeacon (late of Madras), at St. Heliers, Jersey, on the 6th inst., aged 77.
Vinall, Rev. Edward, M.A., suddenly, at Brockman-villas, Folkestone, for nearly forty years vicar of Hildenborough, on the 8th inst., aged 77.
Wilson, the Very Rev. David, M.A., at All Saints' Parsonage, Fyvie, N.B., dean of Aberdeen, and for fifty-two years incumbent of All Saints, on the 14th inst., in the 76th year of his age.

The Church of England Pulpit.

UNPROFITABLENESS IN IRELAND.

By the Rev. FRANCIS KING, D.D.,
Incumbent of St. Patrick's, Newry, and Military Chaplain.

Sermon Preached in St. Patrick's Church on Sunday, November 7th, 1880.

"I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds: which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me."—Philemon 10 11.

"And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name."—Rev. xiii. 16 17.

I HAVE chosen as my text this day a passage from St. Paul's Epistle to Philemon, because it is the lesson of the day, and because not one here has ever, perhaps, heard a sermon on a text taken from this short Epistle. And with this, I have selected also a text from the book of the Revelation, which might appear to have no connexion with the former passage. Yet, as we proceed, we shall see that there is such a connexion; and my object will be to place before you two pictures—one presenting to us the true spirit of the Christian religion, the other the spirit of Antichrist: one a voice from Rome in the pure and early state of the Church there and then—the other the teaching of Rome as exemplified in the conduct of her members in our own land at the present day.

Philemon, to whom the Epistle which we heard read to-day was addressed, would appear to be, if not a Minister, at least an eminent convert to the faith at Colosse, converted by the Apostle Paul. Onesimus, also a convert of the same Apostle, had been a slave to Philemon. He had wronged or robbed his master, and, fearing the consequences of detection, had fled to Rome.

While there, curiosity, or some such motive, had induced him to attend the preaching of the famous convert and Apostle, now an aged man (for he was over sixty years old) and a prisoner at Rome. Under the teaching of the Apostle he was led to embrace the faith, and is described in Colossians iv. 9 as "a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you." Onesimus is now a Christian, but Christianity does not set itself up in opposition to the existing laws of civil society, nor did he receive any countenance from the Apostle for withdrawing his service as a slave from his master according to the flesh. The Christian religion lends no sanction to the idea, that we may break loose from our obligations, because we disapprove of them; nor even, where slavery was an institution of the State, did the slave receive any encouragement in the view he might have had that when he had so long given his services for nothing he might now free himself from all contracts, take the law into his own hands, and even recoup himself for past service at his master's expense. On the contrary, he must now prove the reality of his conversion by returning at once to his master, confessing his offence, making restitution, and submitting himself to his legal control. But how will he be received, if he proceeds to act on the Apostle's advice, and on the dictates of his new faith?

To secure his favourable reception was the object of the Apostle in writing the epistle. And as a specimen of high and honourable tone, of tact and generous principle, and if we may so say of gentlemanly feeling, kindness and consideration for all parties concerned, the epistle to Philemon will bear a favourable comparison with the most polished and elegant correspondence of our own or of any day. The Apostle commences by describing himself as "a prisoner of the Lord Jesus Christ," and after his usual salutation, and tribute of affection and esteem, and expression of the great joy he felt at the good work and "refreshing of the saints" by Philemon, introduces the subject of his letter with the greatest adroitness, tact and Christian delicacy. "Wherefore, though I might be much bold in Christ to enjoin thee that which is convenient, yet for love's sake I rather beseech thee, being such an one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ." Very touching must such an appeal have been from "Paul the aged" to one whom he might have "enjoined," as his son in the faith, but whom he prefers to "beseech." "I beseech thee," he says, "for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds." How full of love and tenderness is every expression! What appeal more likely to come home to and soften the heart of Philemon, another son in the faith to the Apostle? And then playing as it were, on the name "Onesimus," which means "profitable," he reminds him, that though he had not been "Onesimus" in the true sense of the word in the past, yet he promises for him, as regards the future: old things were now past, and henceforth he would be "Onesimus" indeed, "now profitable to thee and me." From this fugitive slave, after his conversion, the Apostle had received much kind service and attention; so much so that he says, "Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered to me in the bonds of the Gospel: but without thy mind would I do nothing; that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly." And then he suggests that possibly the fraud of Onesimus had been over-ruled in the good providence of God for his glory, and for the conversion of Onesimus—"For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest

receive him for ever; not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord."

Such is ever the effect of Christian principle, when it reaches the heart. He who was in the past, worthless and unprofitable to God and man, is now elevated to be profitable. Such must be the complete change wrought out in the heart and in the conduct of every one who savingly embraces the faith of Christ crucified. For "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold all things are become new."

No sanction here for laziness, "picking or stealing," pilfering or dishonesty. The voice addressed to all "who have heard of Christ, and have been taught by Him, as the truth is in Jesus," that voice commands authoritatively, "Put off concerning the former conversation the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and put ye on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour, for we are members one of another. Be ye angry and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath: neither give place to the Devil. Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labour; working with his hands the thing which is good that he may have to give to him that needeth."

How would all in their vocation and ministry be exalted and elevated, how would the whole face of society be revolutionized, how would the trivial round and the common task be ennobled, if all in every rank were so effectually leavened with the Gospel of Christ as to carry out into daily practice its grand precept—"Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons." Col. iii. 23—25.

See the high-toned principle and generosity of the Apostle in his own conduct—"If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself. If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account; I Paul have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it." And to secure compliance with his earnest request, he adds: "Albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides. Yea, brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord." And with the utmost delicacy he suggests the possibility of his doing more than he asks, in granting liberty to the returning slave: "Having confidence in thy obedience I wrote unto thee, knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say."

In striking contrast with the spirit and teaching of this touching and beautiful letter is the teaching and practice of the modern Church of Rome, exemplified at the present moment in a large portion of our island. How different is the picture presented to us here from that which we have been contemplating. And if the tree is to be known by its fruits, what sort must have been the teaching in the past which has made a great portion of our country what it is? How different the Gospel now from the Gospel then? It was then, "Owe no man anything, but to love one another." It is now, "Hold a firm grip of the land;" "Pay no rents." And an Archbishop of the Church of Rome quotes a passage from St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy to justify his flock in refusing to pay their just debts. The Apostle says, in 2 Timothy ii. 6: "The husbandman that laboureth must be first partaker of the fruits." And this passage is quoted as a plea for non-payment of and for withholding debts that are justly due. Any Greek scholar knows that the verse admits of no such inference being drawn from it, and that the main point of the Apostle's argument is, as the contsxt shows—labour first, then fruit. No wonder that with such high authority there should be a crusdea through our unhappy land against common honesty, truth, and justice. It is not strange that "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land, when the prophets prophecy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means, and my people love to have it so, and what will ye do in the end thereof?" There must, we say, be something radically and fundamentally wrong in the teaching of a nation, when a people not naturally savage and ferocious can be led to divest themselves of common humanity in their greed for land, when an island once worthy of the honourable designation of "Insula Sacra,"—"the island of saints,"—seems relapsing into barbarism; "when they knew God, glorifying Him not as God, neither being thankful; but becoming vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts being darkened." And as a consequence of their "not retaining God in their knowledge," we see them "given up to a reprobate mind, to do those which are not convenient, being filled with all unrighteousness, full of envy, murder, deceit, malignity. Without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful, who, knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." Thus in the very districts where want was most heavily felt last year, the produce of the abundant harvest which God has now blessed us with is in many cases committed to the flames, and even the innocent creatures, the dumb animals, are made the subjects of wanton cruelty and mutilation, and the assassin lies in ambush for his unsuspecting victim, and, having put into execution his deadly purpose, walks off red-handed amid the sympathies, if not the pæans and plaudits, of the surrounding populace. Then when the voice of a brother's

blood is crying to heaven for vengeance, amid the tears and broken hearts of the widow and the orphan, young men link together to dance in the blood of the slain still fresh; and the Romish priest settles the matter by declaring, now when he is dead, that "he was a bad man"—a reason which, if true, instead of being a mitigation of murder, should have arrested the foul deed which would send a fellow-man unprepared before the throne of the Great Judge. Nor can we much wonder at the passions of the ignorant being thus inflamed, when the Prime Minister of England himself, in his Midlothian addresses, told his audience that it was the murder of a policeman and the blowing up of a prison in England which made the spoliation of the Irish Church become practicable. The Church of Rome has been favoured and petted by each rival Government, while the loyal have been frowned upon and thrust aside. And what is the result? Why, that just in proportion as you travel south and west, where Romanism is most prevalent and rampant, you find a state of anarchy and a reign of terror, all law trampled under foot, and the effort made and boasted of to sever connexion with the Crown of England, and to put in force the canon law of the Church of Rome, by extirpating Protestantism from the land. Nothing short of this will ever satisfy the arrogant demands of that Apostate Church. She is well pourtrayed in the second text chosen for our consideration—Rev. xiii. Where but with her shall we find the beast with "the seven heads (the seven hills on which Rome was built) and having upon his head the name of blasphemy?" Where else "the mouth speaking great things and blasphemies?" To whom but to her has it been "given to make war with the saints, and to overcome them?" Who like her has the appearance of a lamb, yet the mouth of a dragon. Another feature of that Church is presented to us in the verses which describe the Apostate Church as causing "all both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." This description applies literally to the present state of many in the south and west of Ireland, where the mark of Rome is received by the people.

In order to carry out the reign of terror, and the crusade against payment of rent, a system of "isolation," as it is termed, is carried on. Under penalty of death all are forbidden to buy or sell to any, who have not received the mark. The papers a few days since presented us with a picture which could not be paralelled elsewhere in Christendom. A gentleman with his wife and relatives, guarded by armed police, tending the cattle and endeavouring to save the crop, where every farm labourer, and every domestic servant had fled through fear. The family placed in a state of siege, no one allowed to buy or sell a single article, that if possible this brave man, and his heroic wife and the inmates of his household might be starved out. And for what offence, think you? Because they had given shelter and opened their doors to a fellow creature, a process-server, hunted for his life, by a fiendish and infuriated mob, thirsting for his blood. This is the only crime laid to his charge, and for it, he is shut up, his life endangered, his crops allowed to perish on the ground, and he himself and his dauntless family treated as tainted, and according to the instructions given by trading agitators, shut up and isolated as the leper of old. Such is one case out of many that might be adduced, and such are the sufferings endured at this moment by many of our fellow Christians in the south and west.

Such is the state of things in the less favoured parts of our unhappy island. When our Church was threatened, we then on platform after platform in this country and in England sounded the alarm: again and again we warned that confiscation was infectious—that behind the question of Church revenues there was a larger one, that of the land, which would assuredly crop up next. Our voice was unheeded. The landlords themselves joined in the cry, "Down with it, down with it, even to the ground!" They looked on unmoved, or else they themselves cast the Edomite stone at the Church, and now their turn has come. It is no part of the preachers' duty to be the apologists or the accusers of Irish landlords; they may be bad, or they may be good; as a class they are not worse than other classes.

My desire has not been to preach a political sermon, or to excite ill feeling, but to hold up the twofold picture of pure and undefiled religion in its original freshness and beauty, and of false religion as exemplified in the present state of our country.

In conclusion, it only remains for me to exhort you all, to study to be, each in his own vocation and ministry, as Onesimus was when converted to the faith, "useful and profitable" in your day and generation. He was before unprofitable; so were we, "sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving diverse lusts and pleasures, living in envy and malice, hateful and hating one another." Such, as we have seen, is the state in which unhappily too many of our misguided countrymen at this moment are. But if the grace of God has made us to differ, if to us personally, "the kindness and love of God our Saviour towards man has appeared," then let us as we "have believed in God, be careful to maintain good works." Let us ask ourselves what has the past of our lives been as regards the service of God, the work of the Church? Useful or useless? Have we helped forward or hindered it? How many years has the vinedresser come seeking fruit, and finding none? And would not the sentence be a just one, "cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground?" How few are aiming, like Archippus, to be "fellow soldiers" in the army of Christ? How few are like Philemon, of whom the Apostle heard of his "love towards the Lord Jesus and

towards all his saints." How few like Onesimus once useless, but now awakened to newness of life and a new sense of responsibility, and asking, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Nor need we a more elevated sphere nor a higher position in life, than that which God has given to us in order that we may be useful and profitable to our fellow-creatures.

> The trivial round, the common task,
> Will furnish all we ought to ask,
> Room to deny ourselves; a road
> To bring us daily nearer God.

"Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord."

THE CLERGY AND YOUNG MEN.

By the Rev. C. H. GRUNDY, M.A.,
Late Chaplain of New College, Oxford; Organizing Secretary to the Rochester Diocesan Society.

There is a strong tendency in boys, as they approach manhood, to break away from religious restaints. Nor is this tendency limited to any one social grade. We find it, not only in our leading public schools, but also in retired villages. The gentleman's son and the son of the soil both show it. Unchecked, it swells the list of loungers at the London clubs on Sundays, and produces groups of idle young men at corners, not far from the country church. There may or may not be personal respect shown to the clergy by these irreligious young men, but we all know that they consider religion unsuited to *their* notions of life, a thing for the weak and foolish, a thing they have themselves outgrown, and they adopt an attitude of mind towards it akin to an armed neutrality.

Up to a certain age most boys are quietly receptive of religious truth; then at length curiosity of mind and body is awakened, and, to the amazement of teachers and the grief of parents, the most sacred things are challenged, and the most cherished beliefs disputed, by those who hitherto have been, outwardly at any rate, consistent Christian children.

Those who assign want of definite religious teaching as the cause of this, may be met by the reply, that the son of many a clergyman, brought up at home, *in an atmosphere absolutely pure*, developes from within exactly the same flippant independence as the boy initiated into the vices of a large school; while the network of Sunday-schools throughout this land has existed now for more than a generation, and yet, though those schools are full of *boys*, our churches are full of *women*.

Whence comes this strange divorce between manhood and religion? Is the cause something inherent in the nature of religion? Because if so, it would be unfair to put the blame on manhood. Or is it inseparably bound up with manhood? For if this be the case, the failure casts no slur upon religion. One thing at least is certain, that religion itself is conscious of no such necessary estrangement. The Bible is full of calls to boys and young men: *e.g.*, "My son, give Me thine heart;" "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth;" while Samuel and Joseph in the Old Testament, and Timothy in the New, are proofs that religion can be practised before men have passed the spring of life. And when Christ said, "Suffer little children to come unto Me," He could not have meant that the blessing given them was only for a season. But of course the strongest argument for youthful purity is to be found in the holy boyhood of Christ, upon which it is needful often to insist, when speaking to young people.

Observe also, that the standard of morality laid down in the Bible makes no exceptions. There are no saving clauses in the Epistles, giving special licence to boys between thirteen and twenty-two years of age. On this point public opinion and the Bible are distinctly at variance. Public opinion, on utilitarian grounds, is grossly *un*fair, while the Bible judges all by one impartial code of morals, both for men and women. Nor does Christianity ask for a life *outwardly* much more blameless than the one recommended by Socrates to his pupils, but the difference between the *life in Christ*, and the life by Socratic rule, lies more in the motive than in the acts. There can be no claim in the name of religion, which of itself can be shown so utterly preposterous as to exclude youth from the obligation to obey it, especially if the motive power of grace can be proved in cases we know of to have succeeded in producing the *union of manliness and Christianity*. It is true that characters like that of Arthur in "Tom Brown's School Days" are not met with in large numbers; but religion contains a power which, if fairly used, might render him by no means an uncommon instance.

The ten commandments are a revelation from God the Father, illumined by love in the person of our Saviour, rendered possible for us to keep by the presence of God the Holy Spirit; and they have been gradually endorsed by common sense, as ensuring the happiness of the individual, the sanctity of family life, and the principles of national greatness. Why then should those whose feet are not yet farther than the threshold of discretion be allowed to ignore them without at least a fair trial? There is nothing in them fatal to happiness, and those who keep them love them; hence we the clergy are justified in recommending them to the young man just growing up. But can you expect a boy of, say, eighteen, to really keep the commandments? Must not the rein be held rather loosely for one full of high spirits? Is there not in youth something out of keeping with true religion?

The answer of the Church of England to this is very plain: "Then all of them in order kneeling before the Bishop, he shall lay his hand upon the head of every one severally, saying, Defend, O Lord, this Thy child with Thy heavenly grace, that he may continue Thine for ever; and daily increase in Thy Holy Spirit more and more, until he come unto Thy everlasting kingdom. Amen."

There is not a word here about waiting till a boy has "sown his wild oats," and *then* bringing him to Christ.

Now during the eleven years I was curate in Oxford, it was also my duty to teach classics and Divinity in Magdalen School, and not seldom I have come straight from a class of gentlemen's sons, to teach a confirmation class of boys out of the parish; hence I trust I may not seem presumptuous in offering some remarks as to *the best way of gaining a religious grasp upon boys*. The subject is intensely interesting, because the social evils of modern city life arise for the most part from the divorce of manhood and religion. Boys have a dread lest life should become too sombre for them, if they "turn good" as they would express it.

It is well then to show them that a cricket match on

Saturday need not unfit them for the Holy Communion on the following Sunday.

Keble used to make the choir boys on saints' days leave their cricket-bats in the church porch as they came to the service. Nor can I perceive one single manly pursuit, such as a youth delights in, forbidden by the Bible. It will often be found requisite to explain to young people the fact that whatever renders life innocently bright is pleasing to God. *God loves to see us happy*, is a well-worn truism, but it is almost a revelation to a certain class of minds, brought up by parents inclined to dwell on the sterner side of Christianity, and to treat of judgment rather than of mercy. Moreover, let us preach often about the *generosity* of Jesus Christ in *giving* Himself for the sins of the whole world. Nothing so captivates the young heart as generosity. Then, too, those who really understand boy-nature will be able to put religion in an *attractive form*. Christianity is many-sided, because human life is infinitely varied. The Bible feeds the *intellect* with deep problems, the *imagination* with poetry and gorgeous visions, the *spirit of adventure* with Christian heroism and unflinching courage like that of St. Paul; the *delight in wonders* by miracles; the *affections* and emotions by the love of a Redeemer; the instinct of *self-sacrifice* by the sight of the Son of God *willing* to exchange His throne in heaven for the cross of Calvary. These are days when numbers of books are written especially for children, when boy-literature occupies an important place in the thoughts of the nation, but the rehabilitation of early nursery legends is as nothing compared with what the Bible affords in the way of material for arresting and retaining the interest of youth when vividly handled.

My point is this, that those who realize the kind of world going on in the heart of a high-spirited boy, ought to be able to select and use portions of the Bible and the bright pictures of religion which it gives, so that those beginning to assert their own idea of manly independence should gather their ideal of what is manly and noble from what you present to them, in glowing colours, out of the Bible. But in preparation for Confirmation we have to go deeper than religious sentiment, or simple assent to moral beauty. *Assent is a function of the head, consent involves an act of the heart.* The devils assent to the truth of Christianity, but they cannot consent with the will. They are in rebellion against God, and rebellion is the direct opposite of consent.

We have therefore to prepare candidates for Confirmation *intellectually*, that they may give a *rational assent* to the creed; but we also strive to fill their hearts with *love;* for the baptismal vow can only be ratified by *consent*, by a surrender of the will—a surrender which the previous assent has rendered reasonable.

The Church of England, in her wisdom, chooses to call upon her children to make this act of assent and consent at a time when the brain power is rapidly growing, and when the passions and feelings of the physical side of life are about to put forth their full strength. But the Church makes no one-sided bargain; in return for assent and consent, she holds out God's promise of special grace; grace to regulate the too clever use of a newly acquired brain power; grace to counteract the currents of intense bodily desire—especially dangerous because of their novelty. In instructing boys for Confirmation, these two elements, the *intellectual* and the *physical*, must never be forgotten. In these days of cheap infidel literature, unless the Holy Spirit (and, let it be remembered, spirit means *force*—something added to our natural power) be brought to bear upon the brain, the clever boy may become a brilliant atheist; while, unless the breath of that heavenly wind which "bloweth where it listeth," play upon the hot passion of opening manhood, the dull boy may become a hopeless sensualist. No language of mine can tell what many have no doubt already experienced, the overwhelming sense of responsibility which a clergyman feels when he begins his *first Confirmation class*.

Here let me express (what some hearts will perhaps re-echo) grief at those disasters to character which too often result from the mechanical way in which public-school boys are frequently told off, at a particular age, for Confirmation. Parents are written to; they have no objection. Boys agree together to say "*yes*," when the usual question whether they wish to be confirmed is asked, and the whole thing from beginning to end is a matter of mere routine. It would be well, wherever the clergy can do so, to urge the gentry in their parishes to give them the great privilege and splendid opportunity of meeting their sons face to face, with a few manly words for God, at home, before Confirmation. A young man who had led an impure life till he was weary of it, once said to me, "They had me confirmed at school, when I thought nothing about it; and now that I want to reform, the Church seems to have nothing special to do for me. Do you think I might be confirmed *again?*"

Each clergyman has, of course, his own opinion as to the precise age for Confirmation; but for myself, I may say that those who were older than the average, both among the upper and lower classes, prepared by me either as curate or school-master, have turned out to be more satisfactory than others who took upon themselves what they were, in my judgment, too young to realize. But that Confirmation and its antecedent instruction are the turning-points in many a boy's life, none will deny. Even the Dissenters, though objecting to the rite, own the tremendous influence it gives the clergy. It remains for us to utilize the opportunity God has put into our hands.

There was a picture on view in London recently, which well pourtrays the state of mind to be found in the generality of young men on the frontier of independence. A precipice; a long ladder reaching down into the middle of hell, and rising far above into the midst of heaven, each round of the ladder *below* the level of the rock marked with some vice, each round *above* labelled with a virtue; standing beside it, with his hand upon it, and his foot ready to touch it, stood a youth, a look of hesitation and uneasiness in his face; and his name was given; he was called "*Indecision*." Such was the picture! And the youth on that precipice is the ordinary candidate for Confirmation. It is our duty to take him by the hand, and lead him upward and onward; by the notice in church that the Bishop is about to hold a Confirmation; by searching him out at his own home, and confronting him; by warning, persuasion, entreaty. Cases will arise where the burning words you utter will cause some to ask leave to postpone the great Church step, because, until they heard you, they did not comprehend the awful solemnity of the occasion. Others will consult you as to something they have done or thought, which in their eyes seems an insuperable obstacle to their future purity. In each case, show them the Saviour pleading *with* them and *for* them.

As to the details of the preparation, each man will follow his own method. Dean Burgon advised me to

begin with the Confirmation Service, and when it mentioned the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, to suddenly break off, and go straight to the Catechism. At this point I found Dr. Vaughan's book on Confirmation most useful; while for the distinctly sacramental parts, Dean Goulburn has two admirable books, one on Confirmation, the other on the Communion Office. Early in the time of teaching, it is a wise precaution to supply the candidates with reasons to give to those who may laugh or sneer at them because they attend the classes. The days of persecution are by no means over; and in the warehouse, the shop, the factory, the field, aye, and even in the home sometimes, there is a running fire of ridicule kept up for those about to be confirmed. Candidates should be carefully prepared to endure this, but when necessary to give an effective answer.

On sins especially incidental to youth, it is right to be plain; but the plainest speaking to the elder ones should not take place before the younger, lest in guarding some, we teach others more about sin than they knew before.

On the joy of watching those we have taught and prayed for coming up to receive the laying on of hands, it is not for me now to enlarge. The day of Confirmation is an ample reward for all the anxiety and effort we have borne. There are few joys equal to the joy of that day. One of the *very few* exceeding it is the delight of *giving to your own candidates their first communion*.

After Confirmation, it is good to have some evening gathering, which may keep the newly confirmed entirely apart from the world for the rest of the day. My usual custom was to have a quiet meal for them in my own house, and afterwards to walk with them to church for evening service at eight o'clock, at which there was a familiar explanation of the service of the Holy Communion. Our Confirmations were happily always in Holy Week.

I ought also to mention that each candidate had a book to write notes in when the classes commenced, and the first sentence dictated was, "I fully intend, with God's help, to become and continue a regular communicant unto my life's end." That simple sentence often led to much good. After the day of Confirmation is over, ask each confirmee at which communion you may expect to see him, adding, "*Remember, I shall look for you to keep your promise.*"

Personally, I am not in favour of *weekly* communion all at once for the recently confirmed. Steady growth in grace will lead in time to more frequent attendance at the Lord's Supper, and it is well not to press everything to the full at first. For the real struggles with evil, the hardest battles against sin, have to be fought a year or two after confirmation, when the memory of that glorious day is growing dim, and the pleasures of the world are getting brighter.

What *is* worldliness? This is a question often asked, and oftenest asked by young men. Youths growing up want recreation, especially *evening* recreation. Then the familiar questions we once asked of our betters are asked from us by others. Are amusements worldly? The answer is "*Yes*" and "*No.*" *Yes*, if they cause us to lower our standard of conversation, kill out our taste for worship, spoil our joy in private communion with God. (One thing is clear; they will probably be dangerous on Saturday night.) *No*, they are not worldly, if we find they do no injury to our inner walk with God. Let us add nothing to the commandments, only imploring young men to be honest with themselves before God. Now there are three ways of trying to keep our moral hold upon young men.

First, by communicants' classes, where the remembrance of past vows and promised grace can be constantly revived. But it is found that women are fonder of such meetings than men; and the history of attempts to carry them on is not seldom the history of dwindling numbers and diminished interest. Yet the fault sometimes lies with the clergyman, who, as time progresses, loses somewhat of that warmth and vigour which created the first enthusiasm among the young soldiers of the Cross. We require constant watchfulness over ourselves, lest half-unconsciously, we degenerate into *commonplace teachers*. Every class we take, whether of infants or adults, should have a little of our own character stamped into them before the lesson is ended. Every sermon we preach, whether the critics in the congregation approve of it or not, should have plenty of thought in it, and plenty of earnestness. Those who start communicants' classes for *men* will have to put manliness, originality, and fire into their work; and the fire can only be found by those who wait upon God in prayer, and whose lips will then be touched with the live coal from off the altar. Moreover, the sons of gentlemen have a distaste for anything like a display of religious feeling before one another. Young men of the upper classes are peculiarly shy about showing their religion; so much so, that they will even pass for worse than they are, allowing in public what they disapprove of in their hearts, letting it pass without a protest, though in private they will afterwards own how shocked and pained they really were. Hence, our *second* way of influencing them is by *personal friendship*.

The spiritual destitution of gentlemen's sons is truly piteous. When I think of the number of young men in lodgings in London, whose lives help to fill our penitentiaries and Magdalen institutes, I wonder whether in the Confirmation classes of their youth they were warned enough, and whether we the clergy might not often do more than is customary, by way of hearty companionship with those just learning the perils of independence. Every evening they spend in our rooms is an evening gained; every walk we take with them reveals opportunities for guiding them; every parish duty we can induce them to undertake, even though we beg it at first as a personal favour, not only keeps them out of mischief, but increases their self-respect, and builds up character: every youth we find room for in our choir has a special motive, ensuring his attendance at church.

If we boldly call upon young men to help in church work, we shall find that those who seem at first sight self-indulgent, will, when properly challenged, suddenly throw off their mask of ease, and put all their energies into Sunday-school teaching, penny readings, church music, school feasts, church decorations, parish cricket clubs, etc.; they are only too delighted to find themselves thoroughly useful. Do not let us permit the best young manhood in our parishes to imagine we acquiesce in their indolent Sundays, their irregular worship, their absence from Holy Communion. The moment they discover that we know all about them, and are not the least afraid of them, are not dogmatic about their pleasures, nor hard upon their failings, they will turn to us, trusting us and consulting us, as guides and comrades, in their perplexities. Young men, when they know us intimately, will drop the tone of bravado and defiance, and will talk sensibly and straightforwardly about morality. Our duty then is to urge, both on religious and common-sense grounds, innocent amusements, purity of life, and the goal of a happy marriage. Antici-

pation is a great safeguard. The younger clergy have a peculiar advantage over their elders in this respect. They can speak with the battles they have fought still fresh in their memory, and they will win attention for their words, because they are not too old to sympathize with youth. This one burden especially belongs to the younger clergy, that they undertake the care of the souls and bodies of young men. At no time, further on, shall we be more likely to succeed; for never will our attempts have greater freshness and force. Each time in life brings with it its own talent for work; and the earlier part of our ministry puts us on a fraternal footing with young men, given us only for a period. Read for the benefit of young *men*. Preach for the souls of young *men*. Study the religious wants of boys who will soon be *men*. Let us organize societies for *men*; debating clubs, institutions for creating a healthy public opinion among men, winter entertainments, summer expeditions, anything, everything we can think of, to keep youth busy and moral and religious.

Lastly, let us distinguish between *intellectual* and *moral* doubts. *All boys, verging on manhood, who have strong individualities, have religious doubts.* They are sometimes only phases of character, sometimes merely stations on the road, leading to perfect faith. But the generality of boys have a way of mistaking *moral difficulties for intellectual ones*. Deal first with morality; *e.g.*, those whose lives are not blameless are biased against revelation. Do not enter with them upon intellectual questions till this immoral bias is removed.

The Holy Spirit never promises to guide the brain of a man, *permitting himself one known sin*, into clearness of religious belief.

A youth must fulfil the fundamental conditions for spiritual insight, else his intellectual difficulties in religion have really a moral source. From the soil of immorality spring many weeds of scepticism. Do not stay to pull them up one by one, rather deal with the soil. Put ingredients into the soil which will kill the weeds. Elevate the moral character, and the doubts will disappear. There is a mistaken reluctance amongst fathers of families to speak out plainly to their sons growing up upon questions of manly morality. "I dare not seems to wait upon I would;" the proper moment to speak is waited for, and never comes. A strange shyness holds parents back from their duty to their own boys.

But the clergy, especially those under thirty years of age, have a grand opportunity of warning, encouraging, guiding the young men around them.

Boys of seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen years of age do not mind disclosing their vices to men who are still young enough to sympathize with high animal spirits.

We want moral courage and frankness out of the pulpit, when speaking to individuals, just as much as when lashing the vices of the age from the vantage-ground of the pulpit. There is something almost comical in the shrinking reserve certain clergymen show in the presence of, say oaths in a third-class railway carriage, or light talk on the part of young men in a smoking-room, contrasted with the lion-hearted language of their sermons, urging righteous wrath when confronting sin. Get immoral young gentlemen into your study; chat pleasantly with them, draw them out upon the subject of their own lives, their present work, their future prospects in life, their chances of being able to marry, their employment of leisure moments, their favourite pursuits, and a thousand other topics. Before long an opening for religion is sure to occur. Then show how, even on merely common-sense grounds, the steady life is the happier life, and that self-restraint in the present has its certain reward in the future. Manly sermons, supplemented by manly conversations in daily life; the cultivation of the society of young men; honest disgust for sin, expressed at the right time; intense sympathy with the struggles of opening manhood, these are the best cures for the shallow scepticism and the thoughtless immorality of young men. The clergy, by such means, may win back to purity and peace those who once, before they knew the world, uttered *genuine* Confimation vows, did *really* desire God's gifts of grace, and once were regular communicants, but who, left with least advice and sympathy, at the time when they would have been worth their weight in gold, were allowed to gradually drift away from the landmarks of religion.—*Clergyman's Magazine.*

NOTICES.

communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY NOVEMBER 27, 1880.

CLERICAL WIT.

CLERICAL wit is generally associated with a few individual clerics, remarkable for their abundant share of it; such men, for example, as Dean Swift and Sidney Smith. We do not suppose that clergymen as a body have any monopoly of wit, or anything like a monopoly of it—far from it. If any profession fosters such a quality in its members, we should say it was the legal profession. For there is much in the sharp encounters of counsel, while practising in Court, to strike out latent sparks of witty repartee. As a rule the clerical wit is a rather rare bird; for jesting is not convenient in a Churchman, and his professional environment is not conducive to it. Still, one occasionally hears some witty clerical remarks that are worth remembering and recording. A few of these, which we believe have never before seen the light, we now offer for the amusement of our readers. A certain gentleman paying his addresses with equal ardour to two ladies at the same time, some one in the neighbourhood asked the Rector for an explanation of such peculiar conduct. "Oh," said the latter, "he is at present engaged in studying their parts of

speech, and by and bye he will decline the one and conjugate the other." In a certain Irish diocese were two Doctors of Divinity; one remarkable for the stoutness, and the other for the slenderness of his build. One day walking together, a bystander, struck by the contrast of their appearance, observed that they "represented the past and present of the Irish Church—viz., its periods of Endowment and Disendowment." The writer was acquainted with a retired lawyer who took much interest in Church matters, and produced a large pamphlet on Revision. On the title-page of this was the text, "I speak as to wise men." Like most authors, he was anxious to elicit the opinion of the public on his performance; and among others whom he attempted to draw out was a neighbouring clergyman, not his own rector. The criticism of this gentleman did not go beyond the title-page. "I object," he said, "to the fitness of your quotation from St. Paul, and propose that you should substitute for it his other saying, 'I speak as a fool.'" Connected with this subject of Revision is a witty remark of an Irish Bishop, who, when it was proposed to omit what was called the setting of the Athanasian Creed, observed the result would be this, the Creed would then end with the words—"they that have done evil into everlasting fire," while in immediate connection with this sentence in the order of the service would be the benediction. "The Lord be with you!" A striking instance of ready wit was shown as follows, by the assistant of a popular preacher. The star, finding himself from illness unable to occupy the pulpit, told his curate he must take his place. The notice was extremely short, being given just before the beginning of service. The curate, whose Christian name be it observed was Peter, however consented, when he entered the pulpit he saw disappointment plainly pictured on many faces, they had not come to hear *him!* Undismayed, in a clear, bold voice he read out his text from Acts x. 34, doubtless emphasising the words God and Peter, and preached an excellent sermon on it. "Then Peter opened his mouth and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons." A country clergyman dining with the head quarter staff of a militia regiment was rather chaffed by them, and on being asked to propose a toast determined to have his revenge. Accordingly he gave the wooden walls of old Ireland. The colonel thinking there was some mistake asked for an explanation, saying they had all often heard of the wooden walls of old England but not of old Ireland. "Sir," replied the parson, "I refer to the Irish Colonels of Militia and their staffs." Wit in the pulpit may occasionally be useful, but it is a dangerous weapon there. In the few sermons of Dean Swift's that are published with his other works, there are no traces of his characteristic humour, though he has so largely employed it in some of his essays, which have a decidedly theological character, as *e.g.*, a Tale of a Tub, and an argument against Abolishing Christianity. In his "letter to a young clergyman," he also says, "I cannot forbear warning you in the most earnest manner against endeavouring at wit in your sermons; because by the strictest computation, it is very near a million to one you have none; and because too many of your calling have consequently made themselves everlastingly ridiculous by attempting it. I remember several young men in this town, who could never leave the pulpit under half a dozen conceits; and this faculty adhered to those gentlemen a longer or shorter time, exactly in proportion to their several degrees of dulness: accordingly I am told that some of them retain it to this day. I heartily wish the brood were at an end."

THE ART OF READING AND SPEAKING.

By the Rev. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A.,
Vicar of Brigstock.

Our paper this week will take the shape of an introduction to the above subject. Our object in dealing with it will be to be clear, concise, and candid. We shall withhold nothing that ought to be said because it may seem a little harsh, or, on the other hand, refrain from giving words of encouragement, where they may find a proper place.

Reading is an art. This is a fact that is not generally recognised. We need, therefore, to be reminded of it. The reader is just as much an artist as the painter or sculptor. His art, too, requires just as much patience, perseverance, and practice as theirs. We do not read well naturally. We must learn. There may be, it is true, a natural bent for the art; but this, in no way, obviates the necessity of training. The painter undergoes years of careful and zealous study before he hopes to produce anything worth more than passing consideration: and this however great his genius and in proportion as it is great. He, otherwise, expects, and not unreasonably, nothing but failure.

Why does the art of reading not receive like consideration? We know it does not. It is neglected at our schools, colleges, and universities. It is everywhere shelved and regarded as a thing that may be left to take care of itself. A little—a very little—attention is given to it in the early stages of a boy's education, and then it is made to give place to subjects that are thought more important.

All this is more than strange. But why? Because reading, as an art, is amongst the most useful. It is an accomplishment, but this apart. Learning is to a great extent, without it just so much lumber. We need no stronger argument than this to shew clearly its utility. We ask, with some confidence, where is the good of storing the mind with matter unless we open up a way for it to reproduce itself? The learning may be of some service to the man who possesses it, but, for lack of power to impart it, it is not of much service to the world at large. It is wrong in principle to educate men for themselves. When we turn educated men out into the world it should be that they may be of use to it. And we neglect the one great means by which this may be accomplished!

It is true that some attention has been given to the subject in a few places recently. There has been a revival, so to speak, of a feeling in favour of promoting the art of reading. But the revival is not adequate to

the need. More ought to be done to dispel apathy and excite an interest. The object of this paper is in this direction. It is hoped it may serve to call public attention to the subject.

Now, although we do too sadly neglect the art of reading, we give due and proper attention to the cultivation of other arts. We have schools of every art but this. Painting, sculpture, music—all are faithfully and diligently pursued. There are schools for these things in every important provincial town as well as in the great metropolis. This is exactly as it should be. We do not find any fault with this arrangement at all. Years of training are well and profitably bestowed on these arts. The world is the better and happier for it. What we do find fault with is that so little is done for an art which is quite as divine as they.

But is our complaint well grounded? Are we not finding fault because of the pleasure it affords? If this were so, we should justly deserve reprobation. The art is not taught, for there are no results. Witness in proof of this the long and loud complaints of the *Times* and *Standard* at the beginning of this year. Reading is everywhere, not indifferent, but positively bad. We may not say, as the *Standard* mildly intimated, that we have no genius amongst us. It is not want of genius altogether that accounts for this sad state of things. To see this clearly, we must distinguish things that differ. Talent and genius are often used to express the same thing, whereas they are names for distinct ideas. We all possess talent, and, for aught we know, may all possess genius. Talent is a thing we may develope. Genius, we may only call into action. Often it lies latent and must perforce do so for want of power to shew itself. We have all for instance a voice. We may regard the possession of it as a talent. But how few have so regarded it and developed its powers. The genius that lies behind is, whether it will or not, quiescent. It cannot shew itself. The powers of the voice constitute the avenues from the speaker's soul. If these powers are not developed it is clear that there is no way out. The fire may be hot within, but only the smoke appears.

It is not so much want of genius as lack of teaching that accounts for the deficiency of reading. This deficiency is truly lamentable. Wherever we go, we find the same thing apparent. The Clergy cannot read. The Professors of our colleges cannot read. Scarcely any one can read. Look at facts. We go into our churches and we find that the same hum-drum tone has been adopted. We know from the tone—a thing which ought not to be—that it is a religious service. The disposition to imitate has sterotyped it. A reader ought to bring out his own individuality and not represent another. He himself should speak and not some external circumstance through him. Then how about public opinion? Newspapers apart, is it not a general complaint that public readers are either not heard at all or only indistinctly? It is plain then that something ought to be done.

Here then the question meets us, can anything be accomplished to bring about a better state of things? It will be the object of thes epapers to say what may be done. If there were no remedy, it would be better to say nothing; but as there is and an adequate one too, it is only right to apply it.

(To be continued).

The Bishop of London has appointed the Rev. Harry Jones, rector of St. George's-in-the-East, to the Prebend of Sneating.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—As I perceive that in the "Contents" at the head of last week's Pulpit Dean Bagot's exposition of John xiv. 28 is by a misprint ascribed to me, I hope you will allow me to free myself explicitly from complicity with it, and the more so as it appears to me to involve rather a dangerous confusion of ideas. His view, briefly stated, is that our Lord, having always been equal to the Father before the Incarnation, then became inferior and continued to be so during His sojourn on earth, but at the ascension resumed His original equality. This is plain from the Dean's remark that our Lord does not say, "My Father" *was*, or *will be* but only "*is* greater than I," viz., "as long as I continue in My present state of humiliation;" and from his paraphrase, "I shall go unto the Father, and *resume* that original and essential glory which I enjoyed with Him from all eternity."

Now what I particularly wish to disclaim is not the view that our Lord was speaking of His temporary humiliation in mortal flesh, for that has been held, though I suspect erroneously, by many expositors, but the supposition that an equality with the Father which was, in the Dean's words, "original, essential, and from all eternity," could for a time be exchanged for inferiority, and afterwards resumed. Surely whatever is *essentially* in the Godhead must be immutable and indefectible! As Hooker says, "God actually and everlastingly is whatever He may be, and cannot hereafter be that which now He is not." Hence, when our Lord prays, "Glorify Thou me with Thine own Self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was," we can hardly understand Him to imply that as the eternal Son He had lost for a time the essential glory of the Divine nature, and desired to recover it; it is rather the mysterious extension to His manhood of the indefectible glory of His Deity that we must conceive Him to ask, so that as the Christ, the God-man, the crucified and risen Redeemer, He might dwell, as to His entire compounded Being, in the eternal glory of the Godhead.

For myself, I incline to the ancient interpretation which takes the words, "My Father is greater than I," to express an eternal relation within the Divine nature itself, and not a temporary consequence of the Incarnation. It was the Greek Fathers especially who strongly insisted on the subordination of the derived Personality of the Son to the unoriginated Personality of the Father, a view distinguished by the epithet *monarchical*, because it assigned to the Father the unshared prerogative and dignity of being the Fount and Origin of Godhead. So Bishop Pearson writes, "The Father hath the Godhead not from the Son nor from any other, whereas the Son hath it from the Father. . . . The Son is equal in respect of His nature, the Father greater in reference to the communication of the Godhead." It may also interest your readers to see Canon Westcott's comment on the passage in the newly-published volume of the "Speaker's Commentary," which is as follows:—"It appears to be unquestionable that the Lord here speaks in the fulness of his indivisible Personality. The 'I' is the same as in viii. 58, x. 30. The superior greatness of the Father must therefore be interpreted in regard to the absolute relations of the Father and the Son without violation of the one equal Godhead. The

fact that there was an essential fitness—if we may so speak of mysteries which transcend human language—in the Incarnation of the Son enables us in some measure to apprehend this distinction of greatness, and also how the return of the Son to the Father, after the fulfilment of His mission, would be a source of joy to those who loved Him."

BROWNLOW MAITLAND.

—— : o : ——

BAPTISM.

SIR,—May I be permitted to make a few remarks in reply to the letter of "H.S.G." on the connection of the words "by water" in the office of Infant Baptism. In the passage to which reference is evidently made, 1 Peter iii. 20, the words διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος are subject to no variation in the MSS., and it may be conceded that the preposition may mean *through*, but the most natural sense is *by means of*, especially when the context and the parallel that follows are taken into consideration. The Peshito Syriae, a version which not only claims high authority from its antiquity and excellence, but in this case has more weight from being in the language which St. Peter spoke as a vernacular, the words are rendered *vakhyai bemago, were preserved alive by the waters*. If the translator had understood deliverance from, he would have employed the preposition *meni*. The Latin vulgate has *(octo animæ) salvæ factæ sunt per aquam*, which the Rheims translator renders "were saved by water."

Amongst the early fathers, though frequent reference is made to the text, Cyprian is the only one I can find that bears on this difficulty, he says "He who was not in the ark with Noah could not be *saved by water*, so neither can he appear to be *saved by baptism* who has not been baptised in the Church." Ep. lxxiii.

Among familiar modern commentators, Alford annotates "were saved (from drowning) by water not 'got safe through the water.' The water is in the Apostle's view the *medium of saving*, inasmuch as it bore up the ark."

Bishop Wordsworth writes, "were saved effectually by means of water, which overwhelmed the rest of the world, and so δι' ὕδατος may have also a secondary sense, and mean *through the water*, which drowned the disobedient, while Noah had a *refuge* and means of *escape* from it."

Lange in his commentary, says "the water of the Flood is here viewed only in the light of having been saving to Noah and his family, inasmuch as it carried the ark."

The original, and the early versions strongly preponderate on the connexion of "*by water*" with *saved*, the context and argument also require this, for *Baptism* is parallel with *water* and not with the *ark*, which the other mode of connecting the words would require.

On turning to the first Prayer Book (1549) the passage in the Baptismal office, is simply "Whom of Thy mercy, Thou didst save in the ark." This was altered in the Second Book (1552) to the form which is retained in our present Prayer Book. In the Latin version of Haddon, the passage runs, "*Noah ac ejus familiam e diluvio servavisti.*" And the Latin Prayer-Book in ordinary use, published by Messrs. Bagster, has "*ne aquarium diluvio perirent.*" It would seem, therefore, that the compilers of the office adopted a very doubtful (to say the least) interpretation of the original passage and that Messrs. Bright and Medd in their *ne in aquis perirent*, followed this traditional exposition to preserve the evident intention (though an erroneous one) of our compilers.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

Dulverton Vicarage.

———

SIR,—It seems that your correspondent "H.S.G." takes for granted that the prepositon "*dia*" "by" in 1 St. Peter iii. 20 is of necessity "by means of," and that St. Peter says the eight souls were saved by means of water. I do not think that he says so, but that "the like figure" refers to "ark" not "water."

In Hebrew xi, 7, we are told that "Noah . . . prepared an ark to the saving of his house." Turning to the first prayer in the office for Infant Baptism, it seems evident that the compilers were thinking of ark not of water as the saving means, for in the concluding paragraph we pray "that this child . . . may so pass the *waves* of this troublesome world." The word "so" refers us back to the fact that the child has been "received into the ark of Christ's Church."

Can "H. S. G." find any instance of authoritative translation attaching the word "save" to, and separating the word "perishing" from, "water?"

T. CARRINGTON SMITH.

Admaston, Rugdey, Nov. 21, 1880.

———: o :———

ARCHDEACON BUCHANAN'S SERMON.

SIR,—There are a few words in Archdeacon Buchanan's sermon to which I must take exception. The Burials' Bill has not "transferred our consecrated and sacred possessions to purposes other than those for which they were given." It has merely authorized (whether rightly or wrongly is beside the mark) the exercise of that purpose (viz., the burial of the dead) by a larger number of duly-accredited persons than was previously permissible. This cannot justly be called a *transference to other purposes.*

November 21st, 1880. W. A.

———

The Old Parish Church of East Barnet has recently been much improved by the addition of a New Chancel, built by Mr. Henry Francis Church, a chief Clerk in Chancery and Churchwarden of the parish, in memory of his wife. The tracery of the east window, copied from the Lady Chapel of St. Albans' Abbey, is well-executed, and will be filled by Clayton and Bell with stained glass, at the expense of the parish Churchwarden, Mr. Frederick S. Parker. Festival Services were held on All Saints' Day, and on November 7, when the Bishop of St. Albans preached the sermon from the text, (Exodus xxv., 8) "And let them make Me a Sanctuary, that I may dwell among them." The offertories were devoted to the fund for building the new Organ Chamber, which projects on the north-east.

The vicarage of St. Thomas Charterhouse, vacant by the death of the Rev. John Rodgers, has been offered by the Bishop of London to the Rev. Henry Swann, of Pembroke College, Oxford, and as been accepted by that gentleman. Mr. Swann was ordained by his lordship in 1869, and till a few month's ago, when he was appointed assistant-secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, has acted as curate of St. Matthew's, City-road.

The Bishop of Rochester has appointed the Hon. and Rev. Augustus Legge, Hon. Canon of Rocheste r Cathedral and vicar of Lewisham, to be Rural Dean of the rural deanery of Greenwich.

Reviews and Notices.

STUDIES IN GENESIS." By the Rev. Stanley Leathes, D.D. London: Elliot Stock. 1880. Pp. 199.

In the absence of any prefatory explanation of the purpose of this little book, we are somewhat puzzled to decide to what class of readers it is addressed. With critical and exegetical remarks it mingles pious reflections and exhortations, and the mixture gives it the appearance of notes which might have been prepared for a popular commentary, or of portions extracted from a course of expository pulpit lectures. The apparent object, however, is the praiseworthy one of extenuating some of the difficulties which critical minds have found in the earliest book of the Bible, and of pointing out that beneath the letter of even those narratives which present the greatest stumbling-blocks important moral or spiritual instruction may be found. But the treatment of the various topics within such narrow limits is unavoidably very imperfect and superficial, and the result is that, while the volume is suggestive and contains many thoughtful and excellent observations, neither the serious student nor the general reader is likely, we fear, to get much solid satisfaction out of it. Trying to combine critical exegesis with religious application in so scanty a space, it has a tantalizing effect, and gives the reader the sensation of being uncomfortably dropped to the ground between the two stools, which proverbially illustrate the consequence of attempting too much at once.

Professor Leathes is too much of a scholar to take his stand on those crude traditional interpretations which it was once, and perhaps still is in some quarters, the fashion to make inexorable tests of orthodoxy. Of the liberality of his views, we cull the following specimens. In regard to the old battle over the days of creation, he allows that "as they cannot have been periods of four and twenty hours, they may have been of any length whatever." He feels that "the position of man in Paradise and his subsequent fall is replete with innumerable difficulties," and is ready to accept the solution that the phrase "eating of the tree of knowledge" may not be intended to be understood literally, and that "the narrative may even be an allegory setting forth man's transgression, which originally took the form of seeking after forbidden knowledge." To explain the story of Cain's migration, and to avoid collision with the recent speculations about the antiquity of man, he is bold enough to suggest "the existence of another population on the earth besides that of Adam and his family," and to ask, "What if the record of the creation of Adam; typically true of the origin of man as man, were historically to be referred to the creation of a new and higher type of man than the primeval savage, if such the earliest inhabitant of the earth actually was, and that the record of Genesis is confined exclusively to the history of this higher or Caucasian type, which though not generically different from other types of men, was nevertheless a distinct stage in advance in the development and progress of the race." To lighten the difficulty of the enormous length of life ascribed to the antediluvians, he admits the possibility of understanding the statement, "not of the individuals, but of the house or dynasty that was named from them and that they severally founded;" and generally he warns us not "to bind ourselves by the restraints of a very uncertain chronological system." While vindicating the historical character of the narrative of the Flood, he professes himself "quite willing to allow that the theory of a partial deluge and the destruction of the Adamite race of man may be found to be not inconsistent with the letter of the record;" and when he comes to the tower of Babel he makes short work of the common assumption that "the narrative of the confusion of tongues is, according to the Bible, the historical origin of the variety of languages on the earth," declaring that this "is at once to throw the Bible into violent collision with the facts of the case, so far as we are able to judge of them." We would also call attention to his protest against overstraining the statements of the sacred narrative, or taking them to imply more than they actually say. For instance, he rejects the idea which plays such an important part in Roman theology, that Adam was endowed in Paradise with a supernatural righteousness, and ascribes to him simply a "condition of innocence." "Nothing," he adds, "is said of man's having held in Paradise an unnatural or a supernatural position;" and we can imagine some of his readers to be rather startled by his going on to say, "To suppose that man in Paradise was inherently immortal and exempt from pain, is at once to turn the sacred narrative into a romance, and to charge it with fictions for which it is not responsible. If Adam had pricked or bruised himself in Eden, would he have felt no pain? If a rock had fallen upon his head, would it not have crushed him? We cannot reply to these questions in the negative without vesting the entire narrative with a most fatal unreality."

But whilst we note with pleasure these indications of candour and fearlessness in the interpretation of the sacred text, we could wish for a stronger grasp on the principles of critical exegesis. It is curious, for instance, to find a modern English scholar committing himself to the statement that the ancient idea, that the sons of God who took wives of the daughters of men were really angels, is at least as reasonable as any other, the account being accepted as literal authentic history. Scarcely less are we surprised by the casual remark that "Romans xvi. is the only record we have of the *personnel* of the early Roman Church," when we recollect the strong case which has been made out for considering that chapter to be no part of the original epistle addressed to the Romans, but an independent tail-piece afterwards added to a copy sent to the church at Ephesus. Some of our readers may recollect Renan's lively exclamation, "Quoi! toute l'Eglise d'Ephèse s'était donc donné rendezvous en Rome!" Again, the recently discovered Chaldean tablets, of earlier date than Abraham, which contain narratives resembling some of those in Genesis, have surely a bearing on the formation of the sacred record too important to be dismissed with the remark that they are "a merely antiquarian curiosity." Nor in treating of such narratives as those which relate Abraham's trial and Jacob's fraud, does any satisfactory principle for solving their moral difficulties seem to be clearly presented. We look in vain for a firm grasp on the truth that all divine teaching, in order to enter into the human sphere, must pass through human channels, and be adapted to the intellectual and moral condition of those to whom it is primarily addressed. To us it seems beyond reasonable doubt, that the key to most of the difficulties found in the Old Testament is the fact that the action of the Divine Spirit, in training the earlier generations of mankind, was necessarily conditioned by the circumstances of the times, and that methods of reaching the hearts of the ignorant and superstitious were made use of by the wisdom of God, which in a higher stage of knowledge and morality would have been absolutely

inadmissible. Nothing, we are sure, can be more misleading and unfair than to confront the early records of revelation with the matured conceptions of truth and righteousness in the Gospel, and then either to denounce the Old Testament for not reaching the modern standard, or else to force it into an apparent agreement with it by a disingenuous and artificial interpretation.

Having thus indicated what we think is the weak point of Professor Leathes' book, we gladly testify to the value of many of the practical remarks which are strewn along the pages, and commend to the reader the following graceful comment on the rainbow which spanned the earth after the subsidence of the flood:—"There is something very beautiful and touching in God thus pointing to the laws and operations of nature, and making them the vehicles of His grace. And it is only when this mute fabric of the universe is touched, as it were, with the finger of God that it becomes vocal with celestial music; it is only when the Spirit of God breathes upon the many-stringed instruments of nature that it gives forth sweet sounds for the delight of the heart of man, and is made eloquent with the praise of its eternal and all-glorious Creator."

—:o:—

The Rev. W. Fleming, vicar of Christ Church, Chislehurst, has been elected Joint-Secretary of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

The Rev. Arthur Robert Morrison Finlayson, curate of St. Philip, Chorley, Cheshire, has been appointed by the committee of the Colonial and Continental Church Society as an association secretary for the north-western district.

The rectory of Offord Cluny, Huntingdonshire, has become vacant by the resignation of the Rev. E. B. Turner, who had held the living since 1850. The Lord Chancellor is the patron of the living, and the value of the rectory is £380, with residence.

At the Annual General Court of the Sons of the Clergy Charity, held at the Corporation House, Bloomsbury-place, on Thursday, the 11th inst., the Archbishop of Canterbury was re-elected president, and the Earl of Powis was elected vice-president, in the room of Lord Hatherley, resigned. Six vacancies upon the court of assistants were filled up by the election of Lord Aberdare, Archdeacon Burney, and Messrs. J. W. Birch, Frederick Calvert, Q.C., Arthur Powell, and J. G. Talbot, M.P. The thirty-six other members of the court were re-elected, and several gentlemen, who had contributed thirty guineas or upwards to the funds of the Corporation, were elected governors. On Saturday, the 20th inst., was held the usual Monthly Court for the transaction of the general affairs of the Charity, and the distribution of grants. It has been found necessary to make considerable temporary reductions in the rents of many of the Corporation estates, thus seriously diminishing the income of the Society at a time when applications are more numerous than usual from the fact that many of the Clergy are suffering from inability to let their glebes or to collect their tithes. More than one hundred and twenty applications for aid, mostly on this occasion towards the education or start in life of the children of the Clergy, whether orphans or not, were laid before the Court by Mr. W. Paget Bowman, the registrar, and in every deserving case a grant was made, the governors desiring to encourage, as far as possible, this most satisfactory method of assisting the poorer Clergy. The total sum was granted was £1,080.

On Tuesday week the Archbishop of York left Bishopsthorpe for Biarritz, where he proposes to stay till Lent, in the hope of recruiting his health, which we regret to say is causing anxiety to his friends.

The Rev. Dr. Edersheim will deliver his first Warburtonian lecture in Lincoln's-inn Chapel on the morning of the First Sunday in Advent (November 28th). The subject of these lectures is to be—"History and Dogma: a Historical Inquiry into the Origin of Christianity."

On Thursday week a Missionary Conference in connection with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was held at Southwell, Notts. After Morning Prayer at the Minster, Earl Manvers took the chair in the Assembly-rooms, and there were also present, Earl Nelson, Archdeacon Brough, Precentor Venables, Canon Crowfoot, the Rev. C. Abington, and a fairly large number of ladies and gentlemen. The claims of the venerable society were urged in a paper by the Rev. J. H. Simpson (organising secretary for Chichester), and in an address by Lord Nelson. Mr. Venables afterwards introduced the subject of Parochial Missionary and Ladies' Associations, of which latter he said there were not more than five in the county. At the Afternoon Sitting the Bishop of Nottingham presided, and the subjects of India, its present Needs and Encouragements, and Training for the Mission Field, were spoken to by the Rev. Dr. Strachan (Diocesan Secretary, Madras), Canon Crowfoot (Vice-Principal of Lincoln Theological College), Precentor Venables, and others.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adams, Rev. John, rector of West Hallam; vicar of Offchurch.
Bates, Rev. Percival Walker, Emmanuel College, Cambridge, rector of Charles, N. Devon.
Carter, Rev. William Collingwood, vicar of Little Tew, Oxon.
Flynn, Rev. J. S., missions to seamen chaplain, Falmouth Roadstead.
Hill, Rev. Arthur F. T., incumbent of St. Mary's, Aberdeen.
Hindson, Rev. John Hutchinson, vicar of Wraysbury, Bucks.
Lambrick, Rev. Samuel Stratford, vicar of St. John the Baptist, Newtown, Leeds.
Meredith, Rev John, rector of Polebrooke.
Milton, Rev. William, vicar of Little Marlow, Bucks.
Moberly, Rev. Edward Hugh, vicar of Chute, Wilts.
Norfolk, Rev. Albert S, chaplain, dockyard, Woolwich; chaplain to the Royal Horse Guards and Life Guards, London.
Pratt, Rev. Philip Edgar, vicar of Madley-with-Tibberton.
Ratcliffe, Rev. Charles B., curate-in-charge of Christ Church, Weymouth.
Spencer, Rev. Josiah, chaplain in Cyprus; H.M. director of education in that island.
Taylor, Rev. Herbert William, vicar of West Wycombe, Bucks.
Torbett, Rev. James English, perpetual curate of Hudswell, Richmond.
Whitefoord, Rev. Philip, curate of Leintwardine; rector of Aylton, near Ledbury.

—:o:—

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Best, Rev. Thomas, at Red Rice, Andover, on the 18th inst., aged 85.
Power, Rev. John, D.D., Master of the College, at Pembroke College Lodge, Cambridge, on the 18th inst., aged 62.
Slatter, Rev. W., at Pangbourne, late Vicar of Imber, Wilts, on the 16th inst., aged 57.
Jackson, Rev. Robert, J.P., at the Rectory, Wonastow, near Monmouth, for forty-three years Rector of the parish, on the 21st inst., in his 83rd year. Friends will kindly accept this intimation.
Wilson, Rev. David, M.A., at Fyvie, N.B., Incumbent of All Saints', and Dean of Aberdeen and Orkney, on the 14th inst., aged 75.

The Church of England Pulpit.

TRUTH.

By the Rev. EDWARD THRING, M.A.,
Head Master of Uppingham School.

Sermon Preached in the School Chapel.

"Pilate saith unto him, What is truth?"—St. John xviii. 38.

IN the judgment hall of Pilate on that fearful Friday morning Pilate sate on his judgment seat, surrounded by his court; and Jesus Christ stood before him as a prisoner. It was very early, and the morning sun in all the freshness of day beginning in the glad spring hours cast long shadows on the pavement floor, and lighted up the great Hall, and shone on the hard face, and cruel, troubled eye of the Roman Lord sitting in judgment with his nobles there, and shone on the pale calm features of the solitary man, whose life-blood the fierce mob outside was calling for; and their cries, hoarse and loud, came roaring through the open doors. Such was the scene on that Friday when Pilate, in his conscience-stricken power, asked "What is truth," and God incarnate, the way, the truth, and the life, stood before him a prisoner, for him to deal with as he pleased, as men look on things; and even as he asked he went out, and with his own lips proclaimed Him innocent, and then did the lie—condemned Him as guilty.

What an acted parable! Human nature sits there in its foolish power on its self-made throne of judgment, and with its swords, and its spears, and its skill, and its mastery in things seen, and touched, and felt, asks, as a master and competent authority, "What is truth?" whilst God's truth, in a shape unspeakably far off from all the ideas of man, stands before man unknown, and men condemn by an acted lie God's truth, and condemn themselves as liars in life, whilst they talk about truth, and seem all powerful, and seem to inquire for truth. Yes, it was a strange parable, the power of doing harm and the power of quiet good brought face to face. The snake-power of the natural man, the gathered poison of intellect without God, set on the one side, and the supreme spiritual life, God incarnate, able to do and bear all things on the other. And at the moment the poison fangs had it their own way, the deadly stroke was to come, and "Crucify Him! Crucify Him!" to be the seeming end. And so in its degree it ever is. We shall see why it is so further on.

But, What is truth, if this is a true type and history? And what is falsehood, if this is a true type and history? First, let us put out of our minds altogether the common idea of falsehood, an idea which has done and does more to blind mankind about truth than anything else in the world. I mean that common idea, that a lie means telling something as a fact which is not a fact, a false statement of facts; and hence people get to think two great mistakes—first, that a lie deals with facts and fact knowledge; and, secondly, that a lie means knowingly uttering untrue words. Of course that is a lie as far as it goes, but for one lie uttered in untrue words, there are thousands which have nothing to do with words at all, or with fact knowledge at all. And it is possible for a man never to *tell* a lie in his life, or to to utter anything but good words, and yet to be utterly and ingrainedly a liar and untrue.

Let me assert that the knowledge of facts as such, by itself, has nothing whatever to do with truth. Our uneducated and ignorant poor are as capable of truth as we are, or else ignorance and poverty would be forms of lies, and knowledge and riches would be forms of truth, which is manifestly absurd. It makes no difference in the first instance to a man's truth whether he believes that the sun goes round the earth, or the earth goes round the sun; the knowledge of the outer world from beginning to end has nothing to do with truth, till a man's heart comes into the question. If a man refuses to accept a proved bit of knowledge, because it is his interest not to accept it, he is untrue; but as long as he is simply ignorant, truth or untruth does not come into the question at all; and St. Paul, who was entirely ignorant of modern discoveries and modern knowledge, was not less true because of that; and Abraham, who knew less still, was not less the Friend of God because of that. Until this great mistake is got rid of, namely, that falsehood has anything whatever to do necessarily with uttering words about facts; or, truth anything whatever to do necessarily with hunting out knowledge, no one is ready to receive ideas of truth. Word-lies and questions of disputed fact had better be put on one side altogether in asking "What is truth," because they have little or nothing to do with a right understanding and answer to the question.

Let us then throw aside words, and knowledge questions, as not necessarily belonging to the subject at all. And, again ask the question, "What is truth?" Did Pilate know what was truth when he asked the question, and thought it unanswerable? Yes, he did. Pilate did know. Pilate knew that he was sitting in judgment with power to crucify or let go. Pilate knew, that for envy a set of powerful men had brought an innocent man before him, and hounded on a blood-thirsty mob to cry for blood. Pilate knew that the prisoner was innocent, and Pilate did not easily bring himself to do the great lie. Pilate went in and put questions to the silent, majestic sufferer, sick at heart and sorely troubled, anxious to get some answer to nerve him, and then he went out to the people outside, and tried to compromise matters with them

and escape from the bitter choice before him. But no—no man escapes: sooner or later, more or less openly, every man in this world has to take his side, and choose decisively whether he will do what he knows right, or will not do it; whether he will offend the noisy majority, or give up right; whether he will have the bad against him, or the good. Pilate did know, even whilst he asked the question, what was truth, as far as it concerned him to know it. He knew perfectly well, for he said so himself, that he had an innocent man before him, whom the people wished him to murder: and knowing this—he murdered Him. Truth to Pilate was very simple, the answer was only too clear, "let the innocent man go." And that is the answer always; put in words it is this, "Truth is the doing each moment what each moment you know to be right." Truth has nothing to do necessarily with a man's words. Every word a man utters may be fact, and correct always, and yet the man may all his life be allowing the multitude to slay truth; and his whole life may be one long lie of doing, like Pilate, what he knows perfectly well is not taking the side of innocence and humble good. Truth and falsehood no more belong to words in the first instance, than a headache, or freedom from it, is all that is meant by health; having no headache does not prove you have no fever, or no consumption, or the many other diseases flesh can have. So a word-lie is no doubt untrue, but it is so small a form of untruth as, like a headache, to be scarcely worth considering excepting as a bad symptom. It is the life that is true or false. It is the Pilate judgment, which wants to argue and play with words, whilst the dread life-choice is being made the wrong way.

Now, brethren, Pilate was a boy once, learning and playing in his Roman home. We know nothing about what he did to begin his course of untruth, but we do know that, he, like you, had little things put before him first, little choices of selfish pleasure, or work to be done, of selfish disregard of others, or kindness to be shown. Little did his mother think as she watched him, or he think as he took his own way, what was to be the end. Begin now at once with the answer to his question, "What is truth?" Answer boldly in your lives. Truth is the doing each moment what we know to be right then, and by God's help we will try to be true.

The *National Church* understands that the revised translation of the New Testament will be published in February next. The same paper says that the Baptist minister at Shelfanger, a former student at Mr. Spurgeon's college, has recently been confirmed, and is now reading for holy orders.

On the present state of Ireland, a correspondent writes:—"I am at present attending at a landlord's house, he being very ill of fever. A Doctor from a disturbed district having come to see him professionally said by way of comforting the family, 'Faith, its a fine thing for a man to be allowed to die in his bed these times.'"

ATHEISM.

By the Rev. REGINALD E. MOLYNEUX, M.A., Late Curate of Whitchurch, Oxon.

"For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind."—2 Tim. i. 7.

"No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."—St. John i. 18.

THE words of the former passage come to us as the exhortation of the Apostle Paul to Timothy, the first Bishop of Ephesus, and I have quoted them as a text, in addition to the verse from St. John's Gospel, because my object in this sermon is to ask you to take the trouble to ponder for a while with me on a subject which some will consider a difficult if not a dangerous one to handle, and one which prudence and reverence might combine in teaching me to leave alone. Before, therefore, I attempt to say anything about it, I wish to direct your attention to the fact that when an Apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ would exhort one of the chief guardians of his Master's flock not to neglect the gift that was in him, he bade him remember for his encouragement that the spirit which God had given unto men through the instrumentality of His Blessed Son was not one "of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." The spirit, disposition, or character which dwelt in the well-beloved Son in whom the Father was well pleased, and which it is the business of every disciple to endeavour to reproduce in his own person, is not one of timidity and irresolution with respect to the difficulties of life whether spiritual or material, but one which is itself a source of power and of love, the very opposite of fear, and of a sound and clear judgment; for nothing so cheers the understanding as a conscience void of offence towards God and man, and if the blessing of the pure in heart be that they shall enjoy the vision of God, it is that of the single eye, which is sincerely and honestly fixed upon what is good, to divine instinctively whenever it is in danger of wandering from the object of its worship.

The subject, then, which I would invite you to consider is that of "Atheism," and with this object, namely, that we may the better examine whether any of us are in any degree deserving of the reproach ourselves, or in danger of seeking to fasten it unjustly upon any of our fellow-creatures. For I need scarcely say that the term has always been used as one of reproach; and to be an Atheist in reality, a man must be either trembling on the verge of insanity, or have sunk to a very low stage of moral degradation. Before we proceed further, it may be useful to reflect that the reproach of "Atheism" was the very one which was brought against the first Christians by the heathen population amid which they lived; for the ignorant and superstitious populace, knowing little or nothing of the revelation of Divine Righteousness, which had been made known by the Lord of Life, saw only that a new sect had arisen, which despised their traditional

beliefs and observances, and it seemed quite a sufficient condemnation, even to the more instructed among them, to hear that it was everywhere spoken against. You may remember the story of the ancient martyr, who, when offered his freedom if he would cry "Away with the Atheists!" waved his hands in the direction of his assembled persecutors, and threw back upon them the taunt, which immediately sealed his doom. They *thought* that he was without God, because the object of his adoration was higher than they could comprehend—the Righteous Lord of the spirits of just men, Who required His servants to be righteous, too, and not to confound the worship of His Holiness with a reverence for a number of foolish stories, which had no tendency to make them wiser or better men. He *knew* them to be without God, because, although they boasted of the use of that sacred name, they had no love or reverence for the attributes of truth, and justice, and purity, and Holiness, which have their origin in Him.

And yet, perhaps, it is scarcely just to say that men have ever worshipped that which was palpably absurd; only, when the feelings of wonder, awe, and reverence are once excited, it is so much easier to exercise them in the accustomed grooves than to use the intelligence in directing them in the worthiest possible way. The moment our thoughts are fixed on the mighty Author of the universe, nothing seems too wonderful to be believed concerning Him. We know that we have to do with One whose nature and mode of existence altogether transcend the highest faculties we possess, so that if in any respect we have to modify our beliefs respecting His method of action in the world, it is not because they were originally too wonderful, but because our devotion to the best we can conceive concerning Him has a tendency to be ever suggesting truer and nobler conceptions of His glorious nature. Now, as the service of God, by the consecration of all our faculties and affections to the noblest ideal we can discover or think of, requires a vast amount of effort and prayerful study, it is not surprising that the bulk of mankind find it easier to pay more attention to the outward form of a religion than to the inward and divine spirit which a true faith in God ought to produce in the soul, and we can understand how a pious heathen in the days of St. John would be altogether shocked at reading those well-known words, "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." "Why," he would exclaim, "the man who can write thus must be an Atheist, for he denies all I have been taught from my earliest years about the gods appearing on earth in the likeness of men. He would destroy all that I have been accustomed to revere, in order to substitute in its place a faith which I know not how to comprehend. And yet the spiritual revelation of the Father which we owe to the Lord Jesus Christ,—the faith which men once found so difficult to understand, and was everywhere spoken against is the one which we value more than aught beside—which has leavened the hearts of all who have received it, and it would now be as great a reproach to be an apostate from it, as it originally was to those by whom it was embraced. But now it is the turn of superficial Christians to be in danger of mistaking a reverence for what I must term the accidents of their religion, and for the outward form in which it has been delivered to them for a reverence for the Divine spirit and life of the Son of God through which we have access to the Father. And then it comes to pass that when those accidents appear at variance with the light of increasing knowledge, there are some who fear that the very groundwork of their faith is being struck from beneath their feet, whilst others are rash enough to say, not merely in their hearts, but openly and unblushingly, "There is no God!"

Now so far as I am able to apprehend the matter there are two sorts of "Atheism" which ought to be carefully distinguished from one another. There is first the "Atheism" which springs from an ill-balanced mental or moral nature—the Atheism of the man who has become altogether degraded at heart so that he can reverence nothing better than himself; and the so-called "Atheism" which springs from a dissatisfaction with the current phraseology about God and a longing to struggle forward into purer light.

With respect to the former I have not much to say, partly because I am not aware that I ever met with an example, and partly because, if a man's mind is manifestly unhinged, or, his moral nature altogether depraved, it requires no argument to prove the unhealthiness of his condition. It seems scarcely possible to imagine a person in full possession of his senses, and in a country like our own asserting that there is no distinction between right and wrong, and that everything we see around us is but the product of a blind unreasoning chance. The worst of men we are in the habit of meeting, seem to have some sort of reverence for those who are better than themselves, whilst even of those who do not scruple to call themselves "Atheists," the majority, if they were urged to give utterance to their inmost thoughts, would be found to be objecting more to the attributes and actions that are popularly ascribed to God, than to the existence of some directing and controlling Power, towards "Whom," if they only knew Him, the loyalty of their whole being would be cheerfully paid. I remember once so urging someone who had been giving me the impression that he believed nothing at all, and I soon found that he was just as anxious about what was really good as I was myself—that he had no doubt whatever about a life to come; only there seemed to him such an amount of injustice, cruelty and unfairness in the world, that he knew not how to reconcile it with the government of an all-wise, all-powerful, and all-holy God. Another man I knew, who had been in the habit of talking excessively about the laws of nature, and

scouting the notion of there being any God beyond them. This man, fearing in a storm at sea for the life of one whom he had learned to love better than himself, confessed that he forgot all about the laws of nature, and prayed on his knees to God, with all his heart. I mention these instances to show how likely it is that on growing to man's estate, numbers of persons become irritated at having, what seem to them childish notions of God, still thrust upon their attention, and not seeing their way to nobler views, burst out into rebellious language, which conveys the impression that they have no faith at all, and sometimes makes even themselves think that they have no God. And in one sense their thoughts are only too near the truth, in that they are not consciously offering the loyalty and devotion of their inmost being, to Him in Whom they live and move and have their existence; and the great danger is lest in this rebellion against the familiar assertions, which are commonly made respecting the action of the Almighty, they should rebel also against the obligation to do justly and love mercy, and walk humbly with Him.

That this is a real danger, and the one which we have most to dread at this present time there cannot be a doubt, and over and over again have I heard men speak as if they thought that were their old fears, respecting the future in any degree removed, they would feel themselves relieved of the obligation to behave themselves wisely and to do good. Fortunately such persons are generally better at heart than they believe themselves to be; but there can be no question that for a man even to fancy himself without faith in God is a very dangerous and unhealthy condition, for to be really without faith in God does not imply merely that a man has ceased to believe in certain received theories respecting the religious history of our globe, but that he acknowledges no righteous Lord, to whom the loyalty of his inmost being is justly due, that he has no confidence in, or reverence for anything better than himself, that in short he sees no distinction between what is right and wrong, kind or malignant, just or unjust, false or true, so that were any considerable section of the human race, to act consistently on such principles, or, I should rather say, on such absence of principles, we should be bound to stamp them out like a brood of vipers.

Now there must be something radically wrong with the manner in which our religion was originally taught us, if we are under any circumstances disposed to imagine that the obligation to maintain an integrity of heart and innocency of hands depends upon our beliefs respecting the religious history of the past, or, that any modification of our views can lessen the duty of loving God "with all our heart, with all our mind, with all our soul, and with all our strength." For, whatever ideas may have prevailed in times gone by respecting the character and action of the Most High, the Name of God stands to us for the very best we can conceive or think of —for the All-Pure and Righteous and Loving Lord on whom the devotion of our faculties and affections must be fixed. As we cannot look around on the natural universe without thinking of the Great First Cause to which it owes its existence, so we cannot dwell upon our own moral nature and aspire after what is good and holy without thinking of the Being from whom our sense of right proceeds. The love of God therefore is the love of Goodness, and the grand aim of religion is to teach us to be partakers of the Divine nature, and to rule our own spirits in accordance with God's righteous will. For the human will absolutely requires a higher will to whom it may render its obedience, and to say of any higher will than our own that it is right or righteous is of course to confess that it must be right to follow it. This being the case, the obligation plainly lies upon us to pursue everything that is excellent and of good report for its own sake, and to be on the look-out to profit by any teaching that can have the slightest effect in raising our characters nearer to that of the object of our worship. Whatever instruction is manifestly good and calculated to make us wiser and better and nobler men must be of God, and carry with it its own authority. For, if God be goodness, then there can be no stronger proof that anything is of Him than its own intrinsic excellence; so that it is not the authority of the teacher but the goodness of the teaching which stamps its Divine origin. Again, the worship of goodness is plainly a higher worship than that of wisdom or power, and a revelation of God's righteousness and love claim our loyal faithfulness and devotion far more than one of might or knowledge. An act of power or wisdom might excite our fears; but an act of love and goodness claims the willing and cheerful devotion of the very best that we possess. I repeat, then, that there must be something radically wrong with our religious training if men are disposed to lose faith in the highest and best that can be known of God because they are not satisfied with what has been told them respecting former manifestations of His wisdom and power.

If a heathen had complained to St. John that he was destroying his religion and taking away every motive for right action by asserting that "No man hath seen God at any time," can we not imagine the Apostle replying, "It is true I wish to deprive you of your belief in foolish stories of gods appearing on earth in the likeness of men, but only because I am about to tell you of One who revealed far more of the true nature of God than anything you learnt from your former creed. Hitherto you seem to have thought that the more wonderful a story was the greater was the evidence of its Divine origin; now, I would have you perceive in the *goodness* of the story I have to tell you a far stronger evidence of God; for I have to tell you of the pure and self-sacrificing life of One whom God in His love and pity sent to reveal in the most intelligible form His own pure and loving Nature, and to teach us to love Him through the manifestation

of His own great love for us. If therefore instead of wasting all your stock of reverence on legends which are no better than old wives' fables, you will endeavour to concentrate it upon that which is really worthy of your utmost love and devotion—upon the Divine yet human life of the Son of God, you will find that He Whom you have ignorantly worshipped, is nearer to you than ever He was in the days of old—that you know more about Him, and are able to have more confidence in His never failing protection, than when you believed that once upon a time gods actually appeared on earth in the likeness of men; for, by acting on the God-like principles which were embodied in the life of Him of Whom I have to speak, a Divine Spirit will take possession of your whole being, and causing you to participate as it were in the character of God, comfort you with the assurance of His never failing presence."

If you will only take the trouble to reflect, you must see that it is literally and absolutely true, that no man hath seen God at any time, and also that as man is the highest of God's creatures we at present know, the highest and best man must reveal more of God than can be learnt through any inferior medium. Therefore I have to tell you of an absolutely perfect ideal man, Whose life, though human, was in the highest sense Divine; Who was the righteous Son of a righteous Father, consecrated through and through to the performance of His Will; and I have to exhort you to seek to participate in His loving self-sacrificing filial spirit. If you will only do this, you will have the witness in yourself of God and fulfil the truth of the Master's words, that "whosoever is minded to do His Will, shall know of the doctrine whether it is of God." Now, seeing that the worship of God is equivalent to the worship of goodness, to the consecration of the human will to a Will that is in every sense higher and better than our own, and seeing moreover that the highest and fullest and best revelation that has ever been made of God is that which we owe to the Lord Jesus Christ, Who is exhibited to us as the Righteous Son of a Righteous Father, Who calls upon all men to live and act as His beloved children; it follows, that every one of us, however pious and correct we may appear in public estimation, is practically deserving of the reproach of "Atheism," whenever we are guilty of wilfully allowing our conduct to be uninfluenced by the Spirit of God's Blessed Son. For, if it be true that no man hath seen God at any time, and the best that we know of Him is the character revealed by His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, then whenever we fail to worship that character, and to set it before us as the grand governing principle of our lives, we are practically rejecting God, and living as if we had no confidence in His existence. Therefore, the Apostle wrote, "Whosoever hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His! For God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth," that is, by the consecration of their wills and affections—of their very inmost being, to a higher and purer Will, and by the utmost sincerity and truthfulness in carrying out the endeavour. To hold certain theories about God, what He has done, and what He is likely to do, is not necessarily to worship the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ; for worship implies love, reverence, and inward consecration. To worship God truly you must aim at being a son of God, and if this be not done we are practically without Him.

The conclusion, therefore, to which our subject naturally leads us is, that seeing we are, to all intents and purposes, living without God—that is, living as Atheists, whenever we are content to live apart from His righteousness and refuse to take the trouble to rule our souls in harmony with the filial spirit of His dear Son—we ought to be exceedingly careful in scrutinising our most secret thoughts as well as our outward conduct, and also in passing rash judgments upon any of our fellow-creatures. For God alone can tell who are His, and under many an unpromising exterior there may beat a heart which is sincerely and honestly fixed upon His perfections, and longing to find truer language to give expression to its faith. It may be that some of those whom we are inclined to condemn as being without God are only so in the same sense as the early Christians were without Him in the judgment of the heathen world, because they were not content with the popular language about the Unseen, and longed to be brought face to face with Him whom they believed to be the very essence of Light and Truth, whilst others of us may boast our possession of the key of knowledge, and use, as we think, the most correct language about it, and yet never move a finger in the effort to unlock the door.

To hear superficial Christians, not to speak of immoral men, who have never denied themselves one single gratification, for the sake of duty brand men of blameless and upright lives—lives which their friends know to be wholly consecrated to God, as Atheists or Infidels, because they do not make use of familiar phrases about Him, would be sufficient to excite the most intense disgust, were it not for the consciousness that we are all more or less in danger of not considering the value of the words we use, and of fearing and violently condemning what we do not understand. As I said at the beginning of this sermon, To be an Atheist in reality, a man must be either trembling on the verge of insanity, or have sunk to a very low stage of moral degradation; but everybody knows that men may become insane through persistent wickedness, and numbers who escape that last catastrophe may and do become so hardened against the influence of the Holy Spirit by their want of principle and neglect of all moral restraint that all is dark whenever they think of God, and they know not how to distinguish the sound of that inner voice, which might have been the comfort and strength of their declining years. That voice, be it remembered, is the voice

of the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, Who revealed Him as the Father of the whole human race, and bade us live as brethren for His sake. If we would escape "'Atheism," we must rule ourselves according to the mind and character which dwelt in Him; nd if we do this, we shall be more anxious to judge ourselves than any of our neighbours; and not only so, but a faith in God will be born in us which will be stronger than our belief in the might of evil, and we shall know that He who has disciplined our own souls will likewise discipline those of the rest of His children, and that it is merely a question of time, when the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of God and of His Christ, and the Divine will shall be done on earth, even as it is now done by angels and the spirits of just men in heaven.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY DECEMBER 4, 1880.

AN OUTLINE OF SUBJECTS FOR PRIVATE PRAYER, ON CERTAIN DAYS OF THE WEEK.

Most persons who do not use manuals of prayer, in their private devotions, have probably found that their private extempore prayers gradually assume more or less of a form. And to a certain extent this may be a desirable result. A clergyman, *e.g.*, will in his private prayers always remember his parishioners—past and present—the members of his own family; some of his "fellow-servants in the Lord." And while it may be very desirable that such, in addition to the case of his own individual wants, should be the main elements of his private devotions; many have probably found that it would be well to vary the list of subjects of prayer, in order to ensure not only greater freshness and fervour in the use of them, but also to secure a larger selection and fuller adoption of suitable subjects than would be attained by the practice of using the same outline on each occasion. With a view then of giving some aid towards the formation of a suitable series of subjects of prayer, the following suggestions are offered:—Take for instance the days, Sunday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday.

Sunday naturally suggests three subjects:—Creation, Resurrection, Pentecost.

On thee, at the Creation,
The light first had its birth,
On thee for our salvation,
Christ rose from depths of earth.
On thee our Lord victorious,
The Spirit sent from Heaven;
And thus on thee most glorious,
A triple light was given.

In connection with these subjects selections might be made from the Prayer Book, containing suitable petitions and suggesting further suitable thoughts, thus tabulated:—

	Subjects.	Prayers.
SUNDAY	*Creation*	First part of Collect for all conditions of Men, "O God the Creator and Preserver," &c., &c. General Thanksgiving: "We bless Thee for our Creation," &c. Collect for Ash-Wednesday.
	Resurrection	Collect for Easter-Day. Collect in Burial Service, omitting the words, "as our hope is this our brother doth." Collect for Annunciation of the B.V.M.
	Pentecost	Collect for Whit-Sunday. Collect for Quinquagesima Sunday. Collect for St. Barnabas'-Day. Collect for 19th Sunday after Trinity.

The other days may be similarly treated, thus:—

	Subjects.	Prayers.
THURSDAY	*Ascension.*	College for Ascension Day. Collect for Sunday after Ascension Day. Col. iii. 1, 2.
	Holy Communion	Suitable petitions could be chosen from Communion Office. Prayer made generally that this Holy Sacrament should be more prized and used.
FRIDAY	*Incarnation*	Collect for Annunciation of the B.V.M. Collect for Christmas-Day, omitting the words, "as at this time." Collect for 6th Sunday after the Epiphany.
	Passion	Collect for Palm Sunday. First Collect for Good Friday. Collects for 1st and 2nd Sundays after Easter.
SATURDAY	*Prospect of Death.*	Collect for Easter-Eve. Collect for 1st Sunday in Advent.
	Intermediate State.	"We bless Thy Holy Name for all Thy servants departed," &c. Prayer from Burial Service, omitting sentence "we give Thee hearty thanks," &c.

It is not of course intended that any one approving of the use of such an outline of subjects for prayer, should be tied to the use of any form in connection with it. Each will be best able to judge whether it is best for himself in such a case to use extempore or precomposed forms of prayer, or both. There are other subjects also, such as the Church and the Holy Scriptures, which would naturally claim their place in any complete catalogue; but the foregoing are enumerated as being suited to the well-known events connected with the days specified. The writer is much indebted to Rev. James Carson, B.A., of Winwick, Diocese of Liverpool, in

connection with this subject, and hopes that a much more complete treatment of it from his pen may be given to the Church.

COURTENAY MOORE, Clk., M.A.

THE ART OF READING AND SPEAKING.

By the Rev. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A.,
Vicar of Brigstock.

(Continued from page 572.)

It is attention to little things that constitutes perfection. Any rude mason can take a block of stone and hew out of it something that looks like a lion, but it requires the skill of the artist to bring out all the fine features. The difference between the two men is here—the one gives attention to little things, the other does not. This difference may not seem a matter of much importance to some, but it is the main secret of success. Our object is to make good readers and speakers. We do not despair of attaining it, if only what is said receive strict and careful attention. We purpose to deal with one thing at a time, and, as far as possible, to notice all those little things which go to make up its perfection. It is in this way we anticipate success.

The one thing to which, for the present, we shall direct our attention will be to shew *that breathing is an art.* This may be, and very likely is, a matter of surprise to some of our readers. It is quite true, notwithstanding. Breathing is an art, and an art that must be learnt. It is a thing we do not know how to do naturally.

Here the objector may interpose—But do we not breathe every hour of our lives? Can we live without breathing? And who has taught us to breathe? These questions are very natural and, from a certain point of view, very reasonable. They are, however, not new, and have often been put; but they do not prove anything beyond the fact that it is possible that there are some things with which we are not all acquainted. Let us give a case in point.

Mons. Legouvé relates an instance of one Talma, who sustained a principal part in a play. When he came to a passage that required more than ordinary power, he delivered it with so much energy that, exhausted and out of breath, he was obliged to run and support himself against a wall, panting like a bull. "Fool," said Molé, "come to me to-morrow and I will teach you how to be impassioned without exhaustion." He went, but did not profit much by his lesson. There was another man also engaged. He was thin and weak, and apparently without any power of voice; yet he did his work well, and with ease. "How is it," said Talma to himself, "that this fellow manages so well? I am ten times a stronger man than he, and yet he fatigues himself ten times less than I. I will go and get his secret from him." He went, but his only reply was, "Vous avez tant de succès, Monsieur Talma, vous n'avez pas besoin de leçons." He was, however, determined to find out the secret, and watched him. By-and-bye he discovered it, exclaiming, "Je le tiens, je l'ai pincé." The man knew the art of breathing.

Here, as elsewhere, we must distinguish things that differ. There are two purposes for which we breathe. They are (1) for the purpose of life, (2) for the purpose of voice production. We must make another distinction. Organs are (1) voluntary and (2) involuntary. We will explain a little. We will call those voluntary which depend on the will for action. They are voluntary, if we may so use the term, because they are subservient to the will, and do its bidding. We call those involuntary which are not under the control of the will at all. Now the lungs are both the one and the other. They are involuntary for the purposes of life, for they go on working quite independently of the will. They are voluntary for the purposes of voice production. It is important not only to make this distinction, but to make it, remember it, and act upon it. Hence we are led to see that we train, strengthen, and discipline the lungs. For the most part they are like an unbroken steed, unaccustomed to bit and curb, and we need to bring them into subjection. The speaker's first duty is with his lungs—to control them, and make them do his bidding.

A moment's thought will enable us to see that the work which the lungs do as an involuntary organ is not what we require of it as a voluntary organ. When we breathe for the purposes of life, for instance, we take in the breath quietly, and expel it in the same way. There is an equal, continuous, and regular flow of air into the lungs, and there is the same equal, continuous, and regular flow of air out of them. The lungs do just as much work as they are required to do, and no more. We must not forget that this flow of air in and out of the lungs passes through the vocal organ in the throat. It passes through without producing sound in the same way as it would pass through a musical instrument. It is obvious that air may be passed through such an instrument without producing sound. When, on the other hand, we breathe for the purposes of voice production, we make a use of the air over and above that which we do when we breathe for the purposes of life merely. We take in the air, reserve it, compress it, and then jerk it, so to speak, against the little instrument in the throat. And for all this the lungs may be described as a voluntary organ. This fact is not generally recognised, and to the extent its importance demands. The consequences are in many cases serious. We cannot enter into the whole question. We may, however, observe that physiologists tell us that men generally use only a third part of their lungs when they breathe. And we may further picture to ourselves the tear and wear they undergo if we will try to imagine what would follow in the shape of fatigue and other things, if we were obliged to use only a third part of our feet in walking.

It is plain, then, that we ought not only to recognise that the lungs are voluntary and involuntary, but act upon our knowledge of the fact. If the lungs are voluntary, then breathing is an art. Does this follow? Does it not? The eye, the ear, the hand may all be described as being to a very large extent involuntary. It is also true that we may train, develop, and discipline their powers. So they are also voluntary. See how eminently this is done in the arts of music and painting! Then of what exquisite skill is the hand capable as the result of careful training! And in every case that to which we have trained the organs is called an art. Breathing, then, as we now understand it—breathing for the purposes of voice production—is an art.

(To be continued).

—:o:—

Shortly after service on Friday morning the 26th ult., the Queen and Princess Alice visited St. George's Chpael to see a model of the cenotaph of the Prince Imperial. It stands in the north aisle, between the tomb of Sir J. Shelly and the entrance to the organ loft. The memorial includes a recumbent effiyy of the Prince.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH ON THE ATONEMENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I trust the Bishop of Peterborough and you will pardon a few thoughts on his sermon on the Atonement in yours of 6th of November.

I read it with great care, having also before me a letter from a recent pervert to infidelity, in which the views the Bishop combats are put forward.

I had hoped to have found his lordship's sermon of greater use and help in controversy with my correspondent. Will the Bishop bear with me, while I state where his sermon seems to fail in answering the difficulty.

The assertion or difficulty to be met and answered is in effect this:—'The doctrine of the Atonement is a token of retrogression, and not of progression; it makes God's character now require to confer forgiveness, that which it formerly required not. God is described in many passages of Scripture as a forgiving and merciful Being—Exodus xxxiv .7; 2 Chron. vii. 14; Psalm lxxxvi. 5; Jer. xxxi. 34; Micah vii. 18; Neh. ix. 17; Daniel ix. 9; Matt. xviii.; Luke vi. 37, vii. 42, xv. As one who actually conferred forgiveness on men, Numbers xiv. 20; Psalm xxxii. 5, lxxviii. 38, lxxxv. 2; Mark ii. 5; Luke vii. 37; and in such passages there is no open allusion to the Atonement, certainly no indication to an ordinary reader, that the thought of a Mediator and Atonement was present to the mind of the worshipper, or that he was taught such a Mediator was needed.'

What is to be replied to those, who, resting on such passages, say, 'We are here taught to approach the Father directly, the idea of a Mediator and an Atonement are additions to, and retrogressions from, this teaching.'

The Bishop, reminding us that "forgiveness, when used of God must mean at least as much as when used of men," enters into a long analysis of "*the real idea of human forgiveness*," in which he arrives at the conclusion that between equals, "no absolute and entire remission of sins is possible;" "that for sin in such a constitution of things there is no possibility of remission."

Now when we use the words "forgiveness of men," we undoubtedly mean something real and possible, if words are not meaningless; therefore the Bishop's analysis must be incorrect or imperfect, and it appears me demonstrable that "the real idea of human forgiveness" does not mean the absolute remission of all the evil consequences of sin. And although the Bishop proves such a remission impossible, men have and do exercise forgiveness towards one another; parents towards children, superiors to inferiors, equals to equals, and such forgiveness as we exercise, does not imply or necessitate a miracle.

Forgiveness implies an offence knowingly or unknowingly committed; and forgiveness is rightly dependent in part on the mind of the offender. I conceive we should and do forgive *in various senses and degrees;* those who wilfully offend, we should yet pray for, and entertain good will towards; we receive into favour again, those that are penitent; we love, yet inflict suffering on some, as children; we overlook the offences of some; "the real idea of human forgiveness," as it has always been exercised, therefore appears to consist in remitting some suffering especially our disfavour; it cannot mean *that which the Bishop shows to be impossible, i.e.,* "putting the offender in the same position as if he had never done that wrong."

When the Bishop comes to speak of "divine forgiveness," he does not appear to me to say much to aid in answering the difficulty stated at the commencement of the sermon, viz., in short, 'That forgiveness is distinctly set forth as an attribute of God by Moses, the Psalmist, Prophets, Christ, and that in some passages without any allusion to the Atonement or indication of the presence of a Mediator to the mind of the worshipper; it is therefore retrogressive to believe in a Mediator or Atonement.'

The Bishop in place of referring to this revelation of God's character from the beginning of the Bible, leaves the mind open to the suggestion, that those who think as the prophets seem to have done, "*have the poorest and lowest conception that can be formed of God*," apparently he takes no account of the repentance called for in the teaching of such, and supposes the "Hebrew prophet with an intellect which demonstrated to him that forgiveness could not be without a miracle." A supposition which appears unlikely to have been made by any prophet who believed in God's revelation of Himself through Moses. The prophet's understanding doubtless told him "that for sin there can be forgiveness." What light is thrown on the subject I fail to see by the sentence, "the penalty must consist in the man being cast out of the supernatural kingdom of forgiveness, into the natural kingdom of penalty and vengeance." "A *supernatural kingdom of forgiveness*" *must mean, a kingdom in which there has been sin and some remission.* The penalty consists in being cast out of this. It seems to me a contradiction, as such a kingdom could not exist if there had not been sin and forgiveness.

I think the Bishop shows conclusively that the *absolute remission of all the consequences of sin by man or by God is impossible.* unless we believe in universalism. Some doubtless are and can be remitted; restoration to God's favour which has been forfeited by sin can be granted. Does even the Atonement and Mediation of Christ do away with *all* the consequences of sin? "the endless debt which wrong produces," the consequence of even repented sin, "that goes on and on injuring others by its example or natural consequence?" The Bishop, I think, does not answer the difficulty.

Am I wrong in supposing the best way to meet it, is to allow full force to those passages which declare distinctly that God is a forgiving Being, and which speak of forgiveness as believed in, supplicated and granted to those who, ignorant of an Atonement and Mediator, cried, "God be merciful to me a sinner;" and yet while allowing that, to say *we are compelled on the authority of Christian teaching* (John xiv. 6, Acts iv. 12, Rom. iii. 25, 1 John ii. 2, Hebrews, &c.), *to believe that such forgiveness was granted by virtue of Christ's Mediation and Atonement,* although the worshippers may not yet have known of them; and that this forgiveness implies restoration to God's favour, rather than remission of all the consequences of sin.

Apologizing for my apparent presumption in making these remarks, which may be better from a friend than an enemy, and hoping they may draw forth some further solution of the difficulty, I remain, &c.,

RICHARD GALBRAITH, M.A.

SIR,—You do well to eulogize the Bishop of Peterborough's masterly sermon on "The Atonement" in your issue of November 6th. From the orthodox stand-

point it is the best defence of the doctrine that could be made. Still, the elaborate chain of reasoning is open to some objections, which I shall be grateful to you for allowing me to state.

In the first place I observe that the force of the word ὀφειλήματα in the prayer itself is somewhat weakened by the commentary which almost immediately follows it, wherein Jesus uses the word παραπτώματα, trespasses—a much milder term for sins than "debts."

Secondly, all that the Bishop says from beginning to end cannot undo the effect of the transcendent fact that in this prayer, and in His commentary thereon, Jesus makes not the slightest allusion to the Atonement or Mediation. This is the more remarkable, because He was laying down instructions about prayer, giving in actual words a form of prayer most acceptable to God, and asserting only one condition on which men might obtain forgiveness from Him. Nothing, I say, can ever destroy the significance of this fragment of Christ's own teaching; and in the eyes of those who believe that prayer to be the very words of God Himself, it might be expected to have supreme authority.

Thirdly, the Bishop seems to argue that for sin there is no forgiveness, no remission of penalty, in the natural order of things, and therefore that a miracle is necessary in order to procure forgiveness. This I take to be the drift of the argument. And here, it seems to me, the facts are over-stated. The Bishop illustrates his argument by the case of a man, fully and freely forgiven by one whom he has deeply wronged, who cannot forgive himself, who carries the remorse of his evil deed to his dying day. This is a rare case; but whether rare or not only proves that forgiveness between man and man does not always carry with it the absolute remission of penal suffering.

The next illustration is that of the forgiving martyr whose surviving friends are supposed to cherish feelings of bitterest revenge against his murderers. This I should at once exclude from all analogy with the dealings of God, since however excusable in man, it is nevertheless wholly condemned by our moral sense, and we know that any vindictive feeling is a bar to our sweet communion with God.

Another illustration drawn from the treatment of criminals by society does not properly apply. In so far as society (*i.e.*, man in communities) is bound by God Himself to maintain order and virtue it must judge and punish. Parents and tutors and rulers are all bound to do so in the interests of both the innocent and the guilty. But the cruel unkindness of society towards released criminals is not a thing to be recognised as inevitable, or just, or Christian. It is a glaring blot upon Christendom that so little progress has been made in the practice of social forgiveness, and therefore it cannot be regarded as a part of God's ordained law of the world.

We willingly grant that our highest and best is a likeness in some sort, though poor and feeble, of the Divine. What we deny is that anything in us which falls below our highest ideals can ever be rightly attributed to God.

We all know what the highest conception is of forgiveness between man and man. It is the heartfelt kindness towards the offender which leads us to root out all anger, all desire for revenge, all claims for reparation, and turns our own hatred or hostility into love and friendliness. That is forgiveness between man and man as equals. In our mutual relations as parents and children, or rulers and the ruled, absolute forgiveness, involving all remission of punishment, would often be misplaced and wrong, would be in fact a new trespass against society and against the offender himself.

Obviously God stands to us as not on equal terms, but as a Father, and therefore (as the name implies) as both Ruler and Judge. His forgiveness of our sin cannot always involve the remission of penalty, but for our own sakes as well as for the sake of the world at large, he must inflict punishment. We have no need to conjure up the spectre of impersonal law "pitiless, unforgiving, unchangeable;" we stand face to face with a Father Who loves us too well to remit the chastisement which He sees to be just and good for us; and Who, moreover, can and does absolutely forgive us, and assures us of His forgiveness all the while we may be suffering the proper penalty of our transgression. For God's forgiveness is this assurance of His active friendliness, which follows immediately upon our true repentance and honest desire to amend—provided only we bear no ill-will or grudge against our fellow-sinner. That alone would bar our forgiveness. And in saying that Jesus was splendidly right. Nothing chokes our prayers and stops all communion with God like angry feeling.

I next observe that the hopeless irretrievability of sin and its consequences is overstated by the Bishop. Except in very rare cases, mutual reconciliation and forgiveness not only heal strifes, but purify and elevate the hearts of both offender and offended. Myriads of wrongs of various degree are daily pardoned, evils are overcome with good, sins are cured by love, as though they had never existed. Sin *is* curable; evil *is* conquerable; offences *are* absolutely forgiven. Yes, as surely as the smallest ripples and the highest waves of the sea are wiped out and smoothed down to the level of a perfect calm. God has placed resources in ourselves and in each other by which sin can not only be resisted but crushed. Counteracting forces are for ever at work, by which the storms of human passion are lulled as certainly as the ripples have disappeared from the port. With hearts melting with love and gratitude we claim that the *sons of men have power on earth to forgive sins.*

But to come to the central point at last: Even if all that the Bishop urged of the impossibility of forgiveness were true, how has he at all proved, or even endeavoured to prove, that the Atonement meets the difficulty? That part of his discourse which treats of the Atonement is a *non-sequitur.* I have searched in vain for the logical link requisite to unite the statement of the unforgiveableness of sin with the miraculous remedy propounded.

If God provides or accepts an atonement or vicarious punishment in the death of Jesus, in lieu of Fatherly forgiveness, combined with Fatherly chastisement, what follows?

1. God abandons His own most righteous law, which, for purposes of mercy, entails penalty for transgression; and

2. He departs from righteousness in allowing the punishment of an innocent to stand in place of the punishment of the guilty.

3. He does away with *forgiveness* altogether by having his claims fully satisfied. Forgiveness can only take place by the waiving of just claim.

4. He sets us an example herein not of forgiveness and mercy, but of relentless, merciless revenge, which, if it cannot be gratified against the person of the offender, will be content with injuring another person who is innocent.

We have only to invert the terms of the prayer to see what it brings us to if the Atonement be true—"Let us forgive our debtors as God forgives us;" that is, "Let us never forgive them until some one else has paid us their debts."

Think that over well, and compare it with those words in the Sermon on the Mount, "Love your enemies," &c., &c. . . . "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." The Bishop sneers at the idea of "a merciful and compassionate God, so facile in his forgiveness," saying that it "is the poorest and lowest conception you can form of God." We venture to say it is not the "conception" only of "Modern Theism," but of ancient "Hebrew Theism;" that it is not the poorest and lowest, but the highest and noblest; it is the conception not only of "The Lord's Prayer," but of Psalmist and Prophets of old time—"Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity? . . . . He retaineth not His anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy."

No higher truth, nor any which is so well borne out by the facts of life, has been spoken than this most pregnant verse of devout adoration—"Thou, Lord, art *merciful* (not merely just, but merciful), because Thou rewardest every man according to His work."

I, for one, rejoice in this with exceeding joy, for I know that God will not let me escape or evade one stroke of His rod, which never falls but to bless and to save.

CHARLES VOYSEY.

Camden House, Dulwich, Nov. 27, 1880.

SIR,—I fear Bishop Magee's sermon on the Atonement is dangerous. Observe that he does not pretend to offer an *explanation*. His statement is that God constructed the moral universe on such a system, that pardon was impossible in it, unless it was broken up by a moral miracle; and accordingly He did break it up by miracles of the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ His Son. *How* the miracle works he confesses to be inscrutable. That is, he explains nothing. And the sceptic is left free to ask, "How is it possible to conceive of God framing His universe on a system, which He finds Himself compelled to shatter to pieces before He can forgive a penitent sinner?"

M. B.

THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

SIR,—I feel it necessary to ask for your permission to make a few remarks on the letter from the Rev. Brownlow Maitland, which appeared in your last number, and in which he comments upon an explanation of mine of John xiv 28, which appeared in the preceding number. With the circumstance of that explanation having been accidentally attributed to him in the table of contents, I have nothing to do. I, of course, am not responsible for this. What I wish to say is that he has misrepresented me by confounding *nature* with *glory*, as regards the Second Person of the Trinity. He says of me as follows:—

> "His view briefly stated, is that our Lord having always been equal to the Father before the Incarnation, then became inferior and continued to be so during His sojourn on earth."

Now I complain of this statement as being both inadequate and incorrect. It by no means gives my view of the subject, for it is evident from his subsequent remarks that he here employs the words "equal" and "inferior" with reference to *nature*, but I hold most distinctly that there could have been no change in the intrinsic and essential nature of God the Son, so that the Son should have thus become inferior to the Father. I was speaking entirely of the *glory* which the Son had with the Father from all eternity; and *glory* belongs, not to the *intrinsic nature*, but to the *extrinsic surroundings* of Godhead, as it is symbolized in Rev. iv. 2 as "an emerald rainbow *round about* the throne." This glory the Son of God—the WORD which was made flesh—did undoubtedly lay aside, and by doing so, "though he was rich yet he became poor" (2 Corinthians viii. 9), "and made Himself of no reputation," or, literally, emptied himself—that is, of his pre-existent glory which He had when He was "in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God" (Phil. ii. 6, 7). In this respect, though He and the Father are One as to their essential nature and being (John x. 30), yet the Father was greater than He while He tabernacled upon earth, for this inferiority as regards glory began with His Incarnation, and was only temporary, and was to cease on His going unto the Father, as His prayer in John xvii. 5 clearly shews—"Now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine Own Self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was;" and accordingly He is represented in Rev. iii. 21 as being after His ascension "Set down with the Father on His throne."

As to the remainder of Mr. Maitland's letter, and his proposed explanation of the words—"My Father is greater than I," I make no remark except to request his and your readers' attention to the statements which occur in that wonderful exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity or Triunity, and of the common Deity of the three Persons, which the Athanasian Creed contains—"The Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one; the glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son; and such is the Holy Ghost." "And in this Trinity none is afore or after other, none is greater, or less than another; but the whole three persons are co-eternal together and co-equal," and the Son is "equal to the Father as touching His Godhead."

DANIEL BAGOT, Dean, &c.

Surbiton, 29th Nov., 1880.

SIR,—I was somewhat startled at the statement made by the Rev. Brownlow Maitland in the beginning of his letter, where he says Dean Bagot's exposition of John xiv. 28 involves "rather a dangerous confusion of ideas," as I consider Dean Bagot a sound theologian, as well as a Scholar. I therefore had recourse to your issue of the 20th and carefully perused the extract referred to. And I must say that I am fully convinced that the charge which the Rev. Brownlow Maitland makes against the Dean is totally unfounded, there is not the slightest appearance of any "confusion of ideas" to a clear mind in reading the exposition. The part to which Mr. Maitland takes exception is where the Dean says—"I shall cease to be the Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief, I shall go unto the Father, and resume that original and essential glory which I enjoyed with Him from all eternity for as long as I continue in my present state of humiliation. My Father is greater in glory than I, but when the days of my present tabernacling in the flesh shall terminate I shall then be exalted to the right hand of the Father, and be glorified with his Self with the glory which I had with Him before the world was." This is the whole passage which contains according to Mr. Maitland "rather a dangerous con-

fusion of ideas," which he wishes to disclaim, and especially "the supposition that an equality with the Father, which was in the Dean's words, "original, essential and from all eternity," could for a time be exchanged for inferiority, and afterwards resumed.

Now the passage which I have just referred to of the Dean's, does not make any allusion whatever to our Lord *exchanging His equality with the Father for inferiority*. I therefore think it very unfair to attribute to a man what he never has said. The Dean's statement contains nothing contray to Scripture, but everything which is in accordance with the teaching of our Lord Himself and His Apostles. And everything that is in keeping with the Church of England, "that the Father is greater than the Son as touching His Manhood, but that They are co-eternally, and co-equally one;" and that what we believe of the glory of the Father the same we believe of the Son without any difference or inequality.

When Christ prays for "the glory" He "had with" God "before the world was," He prays to be set at God's right hand in full exercise of His Divine glory, which He truly had with His Father from all eternity; but which in the time of His humiliation, for the salvation of mankind, hath, as it were, been hidden in His human nature. St. Paul tells us in Philippians ii. 7: That He "made Himself of no reputation," literally He emptied Himself of His glory. *Semetipsum exinanivit*, "and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." That is, that He laid aside the use of His Divine glory for a time to accomplish the work of our Redemption in the state of humiliation. He kept it hidden in His human nature, letting only some small rays of the same shine forth in His miracles and other works. Thus taking the form of a servant and being made in the likeness of men. "He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross." "Wherefore, saith the Apostle, "God also hath highly exalted Him." That is after His Resurrection and Ascension He sat down on the right hand of God in the highest glory (Eph. i. 20, Heb. i. 3), which according to His Divine nature He had from all eternity. But seeing that He had, as it were, emptied Himself of the use thereof in the state of His humiliation. He took the same upon Him again after His Ascention, and shewed it gloriously. And His human nature both in body and soul was adorned with as high glory and blessedness as a creature can receive, far surpassing all the glory of angels and other men.

I should like the Rev. Browland Maitland to carefully read Philippians ii. 6-9, and to mark the contrast the Apostle shows between Christ's former glorious, and His present humble state, when he makes use of the expressions ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ and ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος. And I would also ask him to note the four successive stages in Christ's history, which St. Paul in the same place adverts to (1) His original glory, (2) His exinanition. (3) His farther humiliation unto the Death on the Cross, (4) His final exaltation. And when he has done so, I hope he will see his error in accusing Dean Bagot wrongfully, and that it was his own "ideas" which were "confused" and not the Dean's.

Many people still like "Eutyches" of old are inclined to hold false notions regarding the Incarnate Word. Who, although they might not avow their erroneous tenets openly, yet by their misty and inexplicable statements, leave you to infer that their doctrine is not sound. It may be, perhaps, out of a great zeal to guard against a humanitarian view of Christ that they have been led to represent Him, as having but one nature; and thus they make the human to be absorbed into the Divine.

Burnett, on Article ii., in reference to Philippians ii. 6-11, says: "Now in this progress that is made in these words, it is plain that the dignity of Christ's person is represented, as antecedent both to His humiliation and His exaltation. It was that which put the value on His humiliation, as His humiliation was rewarded by His exaltation."

As to Mr. Brownlow Maitland's quotation from *Hooker*, all I can say is that I quite agree with it, and so does Dean Bagot. For what is it when Hooker says—"as the Christ, the God-man, the Crucified and risen Redeemer, He might dwell, as to His entire compounded Being, in the eternal glory of the Godhead"—but what the Dean says, although expressed differently, when he says, "I shall then be exalted to the right hand of My Father, and be glorified with His own Self with the glory which I had with Him before the world was."

When the WORD became flesh, there was no change in the Divine Nature of the Son. There was an hypostatic Union, *i.e.*, the combined substance of two natures in one person without confusion of substance, both natures preserving their peculiar properties. Our Lord took "the form of a servant," but He lost not "the form of God." "He despoiled not Himself of the perfections of Deity—He was indeed emptied, and became of no reputation;" but He did not cease to be God, though He was reputed to be only a man, and a very mean one, too. The glory of His Divinity was not extinguished nor diminished, though it was obscured and darkened under the veil of our infirmities; but there was no more change in the hiding of it than there is in the body of the sun when it is shadowed by the interposition of a cloud. He could not have been a sufficient Mediator had He ceased to be God, had He lost any one perfection proper to the Divine nature; and losing none, He lost not this of unchangeableness, which is none of the meanest belonging to the Deity. *That is truly a change when a thing ceaseth to be what it was before, this was not in Christ.* He assumed our nature without laying aside His own. . . . And when He prays "for the glory He had with God before the world was," He prays that a glory He had in His Deity might shine forth in His person as Mediator, and be evinced in that height and splendour suitable to His dignity, *which had been so lately darkened by His abasement*, in order that, as He had appeared to be the Son of Man in the infirmity of the flesh, He might appear to be the son of God in the glory of His person, that He might appear to be the Son of God, and the Son of Man in one person."

J. C. MONTGOMERY.

Guildford, Nov. 30th, 1880.

THE MEMORIAL TO THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

A Public Meeting of Clergy and Laity was held Nov. 25th at the National Society's Rooms, to receive the report of the Memorial Committee, in connection with the Testimonial Fund. There were present Clergy and Laymen from many parts of England, including Derby, St. Albans, Leicester, Lincoln, London, Notts, Oxon, Suffolk, York, etc. Letters were received from Earl Nelson, Lord Henry Scott, Hon. St. Jno. Brodrick,

Hon. Wilbraham Egerton, Rt. Hon. A. J. B. Beresford-Hope, Rt. Hon. J. G. Hubbard, Rt. Hon Sir J. R. Mowbray, J. G. Talbot, M.P., A. J. Balfour, M.P., E. Clarke, M.P., Colonel Mallins, Canons Miles, Howell, etc., etc.

Earl Nelson's recent tour in Lincoln and Nottingham on behalf of the S.P.G. had more than ever convinced him of the necessity of forming the new See, and that speedily, if we would really help the overworked Bishops of Lincoln and Lichfield before it is too late.

Lord Henry Scott's principal interest in the proposed Fund as a contribution to the Endowment of the See of Southwell, was as a Memorial to the Bishop of Lincoln personally, and particularly as a Testimony of his gallant conduct as to the Burials Bill.

The Hon. W. Egerton expressed his regret at his unavoidable absence, and his trust that the Testimonial to Bishop Wordsworth would be worthy of its object and would assist in founding the Southwell Bishopric within a reasonable time.

The movement had the heartiest sympathy of Sir J. R. Mowbray, who hoped that we should soon see all the Sees founded which were contemplated in the recent Act. His local connections with Truro and Newcastle gave those Sees however the first claim upon him.

Mr. Talbot wrote expressing his earnest sympathy with the objects of the Meeting and his hope that the Bishopric would shortly be founded. He thought it was very much to be desired in the interests of the Church generally that the Bishopric authorized by the recent Act of Parliament should be established without delay, and he trusted that a special impetus would be given to the Southwell Scheme by the expression of respect which the Bishop of Lincoln's brave defence of the Church's rights had evoked.

The Bishop of Nottingham, on taking the chair, described the origin of the *Address of Thanks*, and then of the *Testimonial* to the Bishop of Lincoln, "That learned and faithful Bishop," he added, "whom I am proud to act under and look up to as an elder brother, has expressed his intention of giving any testimonial money that might be raised to the endowment of the Southwell Bishopric. I congratulate this meeting, although not large, on being representative of the Clergy and Laity of so many Dioceses. I call upon the Rev. E. W. Whitaker, R D., to move the first resolution."

Rev. E. W. Whitaker—"My Lord Bishop, it gives me great pleasure to testify to the great labours and self-denials of the Bishop of Lincoln, on behalf of the Church; as one of its Chief Pastors he has always been faithful to his trust. I deeply admire and respect his sound scholarship and profound learning, which is an ornament to the nation as well as the Church. Surely no effort should be spared to save such a valuable life. I can demonstrate from the experience of my own Diocese (Lichfield), that the establishment of the See of Southwell will be the best means under Providence of prolonging that life." Here the speaker instanced the untimely death of his late Diocesan (Selwyn), and the enormous and often unfulfilled labours of his present one. "In order to stimulate the creation of this much-required See, I am commissioned by a friend, 'Tenax Propositi,' to subscribe £50 towards this, on condition that nineteen other like amounts are subscribed within three or six months. I beg to move the resolution:—

That this meeting of Clergy and Laity from all parts of England, desire to thank the Bishop of Lincoln most heartily for his brave defence of the Church, with respect to her churchyards, in a time of severe trial and difficulty.

W. N. Heygate, Esq., in seconding the resolution, said "I must regret that this meeting has been held at such a dull time of the year, when so many of the Laity are out of town. Mr. Beresford Hope desires me to express his concurrence in this regret. I can assure the meeting that the Laity are not one whit behind the Clergy in their profound respect and admiration for the author of *Theophilus Anglicanus*. As a Westminster boy I am personally much indebted to Dr. Wordsworth, for my knowledge of Divinity and Church principles."

The Rev. W. M. H. Church (Yorkshire), who had come up from Hickleton, near Doncaster, to attend the meeting, supported the resolution, and suggested that there should be no formal closing of the Fund, but that when the Committee had concluded their labours it should be open to individuals to contribute to the Southwell Bishopric Endowment under the head of the Wordsworth Memorial.

The Chairman explained that there would be another meeting of the subscribers, when he hoped to be able to announce that a much larger sum had been contributed than the present £317. and when Mr. Church's suggestion might be taken into consideration.

The resolution, on being put to the meeting, was carried unanimously.

(To be be continued.)

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Batty, Rev. George Staunton, late curate of St. John's, Fulham; vicar of North Mymms, Hatfield, Herts.

Black, Rev. Charles N., curate of Milton-next-Gravesend; Incumbent of St. James', Aberdeen.

Boys, Ven. Archdeacon, formerly of Bombay, vicar of Hildenborough, near Tonbridge.

Bush, Rev. Robert Wheler, rector of St. Michael, Wood-street; rector of St. Alphage, London-wall.

Crozier, Rev. J. A., late chaplain to the Household Cavalry, London; vicar of Weston, near Crewe.

Evans, Rev. Edward Muirhead, vicar of Sandgate.

Fleming, Rev. James Atkinson Bulman, curate of St. Matthias', Salford; rector of St. Peter, Rockland, Norwich.

Fountaine, Rev. J., of Queen's College, Oxford, chaplain of the Bristol City and County Lunatic Asylum.

Goody, Rev. C. J., curate of St. Marylebone; vicar of Whetstone.

Green, Rev. F. C., vicar of Ramsgill, Yorks; vicar of All Saints,' Denmead, near Horndean, Hants.

Harries, Rev. Evan, incumbent of Christ Church, Pendlebury.

Hill, Rev. Walter Blachford, rector of Chettle, Dorset.

Hill, Rev. William Alfred, vicar of St. Andrew and St. Mary Magdalen, Maidenhead, Berks.

Houblon, Rev. T. H. A., vicar of Peasemore; vicar of Wantage.

—: o :—

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Hughes, Rev. James Henry, M.A., at Southsea, formerly Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Retired Senior Chaplain, Bombay Presidency, on the 19th Oct., aged 75.

Newton, Rev. John F., at the Vicarage, Kirby, in Cleveland, Yorkshire, for fifty-two years Vicar of the parish, on the 23rd ult, in his 90th year.

Stansfield, Rev. John, at the Vicarage, Coniston Cold, for thirty-four years Vicar of the parish, on the 21st ult., aged 66.

Sadlier, Rev. Henry A., M.A., at 25, Coates-gardens, Edinburgh, formerly Prebendary of Killenelick, diocese of Emly, Ireland, and late Rector of Begbroke, Oxon, on the 28th ult.

Vernon, Rev. William Hardy, M.A., at Wootton Vicarage, Bedford, after a few days' illness, on the 25th ult., aged 86.

Wood, Rev. Richard, B.D., Rector of St. Alphage, London-wall, late fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and formerly Vicar of Christ Church, Paddington, on the 22nd ult., in his 70th year.

Woollcombe, Rev. E. C., at 28, Kensington-gate, W., of Tendring, Essex, and late Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford, on the 22nd ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE BIBLE THEORY OF MAN'S UNHAPPINESS.

By the BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford on Sunday, November 28, 1880.

"And when He came to Himself, He said, How many hired servants of My Father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger!"—St. Luke xv. 17.

THERE are two tests to which we have a right to submit every new religion. There are two questions which we have a right, and which it is our duty, to put to every one who claims to come to us as a teacher from God. And these two questions are, first, "What have you to tell us concerning the nature of God?" and, secondly, "What have you to tell us concerning the nature of man?" We have the right, and it is our duty to put these questions, because religion is the science of the relations between God and man. Every religion, therefore, that is properly so called, aims at giving us some information concerning these relations, and concerning the duties that arise out of them. It follows from this that every religion necessarily and primarily bases itself on certain facts, or alleged facts, in the nature of God and in the nature of man, which must condition and create those relations and those duties. What God is or may be to us, and what we are or may be to God, necessarily arise out of what God is in Himself, and what we are in ourselves. And therefore every religion must necessarily have its idea or theory concerning God, and its idea or theory concerning man. We have a right to ask every religious teacher for these ideas and these theories before we hear him speak of the relations and duties that arise out of them, and by the truth or falsehood of these theories all the rest that he has to say must submit to be judged, so far, at least, as this, that if he tells us anything concerning God, or anything concerning man which is demonstrably false, which our reason or our conscience rejects, we must reject him. It is not that we may do so, or that we ought to do so, but we are so constituted—happily so constituted—that we simply cannot accept such teaching. We have the right, then, as I have said, to say this to every teacher of religion: "What have you to tell us of these two great questions? Rehearse the articles of your belief concerning God, and concerning man." Now, of these two tests, it is quite clear which is the simplest and most easy to apply. Obviously the second. We do know the nature of man, or think we do. Of the divine nature we are necessarily and naturally in comparative ignorance. We do know something of human life, and of its circumstances, and therefore he who tells us that concerning man's nature which we know to be untrue has lost his claim upon our attention when he goes on to tell us something concerning God. If he has told us earthly things that we simply cannot believe, how can we believe when he goes on to tell us of heavenly things? Convicted of falsehood, or of absurdity, as regards the things of the visible, he can have no trustworthy message for us as concerning the invisible. To this test I am about to-day to submit that religion in which we all of us profess to believe. I am about to ask you to consider in the light of this test, as regards its theory of humanity, the religion of the Bible. There is a theory concerning man's nature and condition on which the whole of this book, and all it professes to teach us, is based. We ask you, for a few moments, to consider whether this theory approves itself to you as true, and we are about to contrast with it certain other theories that we are asked to accept instead of this. And we do so with this further desire and intent, that if, on the one hand, it is not true, that if the theory is demonstrably false, we cannot accept it; so, on the other hand, if it is demonstrably true to our nature, or if it be highly probable, if there be in the nature of that which we profess to describe that which commends itself to our very innermost being; if, when the teacher speaks, the very flesh and heart cry out, "I know it to be true by what is within me and what I feel;" if this revelation, or this professed revelation, finds out depths of our nature, which nothing else does, then we are prepared to go with the teacher as he tells us of the things that we have not seen, of the divine nature that we cannot of ourselves comprehend, and of the duties, hopes, fears, promises and helps of the future—the vast and infinite future—which lie, in all the relations, between humanity and God. And to all these things we are the more prepared to listen, because of the revealing and verifying light which his teaching has shed upon a nature that we do know, and to some degree we do understand. Let us then understand, in the first place, what is the test to which we propose to submit this theory of the Bible concerning the nature of man. I propose to bring it to the test by one admitted and notorious fact in the nature and condition of man, and to see how it explains that fact, and how it proposes to deal with it. And the fact is described in the verse I have read to you — it is the admitted and notorious fact of the exceptional unhappiness of man. Our Lord in this parable confronts Himself with this fact, as every teacher of the Gospel, or good news, must do if he is to win the attention of men. The hero of this story, the Prodigal Son, is, as you see, a sufferer, but he is more than that, he is an exceptional sufferer. All the other creatures described in the parable—the

lower servants of the Father's house—have bread enough and to spare; he alone suffers hunger. And more than this, he is a strangely exceptional sufferer, for he who suffers is infinitely superior to those who are happy. They are but the hired servants in the house, and he the son — raised above them all in nearness to the Father and the Ruler of the great household—he alone is perishing with hunger. Is this a true description, then, of humanity, is it true that man is unhappy, and that he is exceptionally unhappy? That man is unhappy we do know; that at least is mere common-place human experience. All our own knowledge, all that we know of the experience of others, all human literature, is full even to triteness of this common-place history of human unhappiness. The poet, the philosopher, the moralist, the satirist treat it in different ways, but they all acknowledge it — the sadness, the sorrowfulness, the weariness, the littleness of life that force themselves upon our experience and our contemplation from time to time. Men may laugh at this life of ours as they do in one mood, or weep over it in another mood; or may madden over it when they pore over the mystery of human misery, but the confession of all alike, at some time or other of their life, is one and the same thing, "Man that is born of woman hath but a short time to live, and is full of misery." This is, at least, an accepted fact, a notorious fact, but there is more than this in it. Man's unhappiness is not only a fact, but it is an exceptional fact. Man is not only unhappy, but he is unquestionably the most unhappy creature in creation. By contrast with him all other creatures may be said to be happy. Nay, are they not actually happy? Is not the life of the lower animals a life of pure physical enjoyment? The mere joy of life, the happiness of existence, that we see and envy in the little child, and which the little one loses so soon as it grows up to boyhood and to manhood; this happiness of the little life, how strongly marked it is in the animal creation! Their lives are unvexed by care, untroubled by anxiety, unhaunted by the fear of death." "They know a happy youth, and their old age is beautiful and free. In the whole of their happy existence they have prehaps but the one single pang of terror or pain that ends their life. And man is an exception to all this: man is a strange exception to all this. How comes it, as you ascend from one rank to another in all orders of animal existence, by slow and regular and uniform progression—how is it that man, the outcome of ages—how is it that man, the perfection and glory of all these existences, each glorying in its perfection, each in its turn contributing something as it grew up and passed into something higher—how is it when you reach this crown and glory of all creation you come to something infinitely more unhappy than all the rest? Man seems to pay the price of his rank and standing in the great household of the universe by this, that he is capable of an infinity of agonies and that he pays the tax of misery for his greatness that all the others are exempt from. That, at least, is an admitted fact. And that is not all. We might be told, and fairly told, that this, after all, is but the working out of a great law that governs all creation—that the susceptibility to pleasure must always be purchased by a corresponding susceptibility to pain, that you cannot have the high sensibility that gives pleasure without at the same time being liable to the exquisite pain that arises from the disturbance of this. And so it may be said that if man is the most unhappy, he is at times the most happy creature in creation; and that a happy man is, at any rate, infinitely happier than a happy brute. This is true and yet what a strange, what a sad out-look this gives us for the progress of the race of which we hear so much in our day. Is it true that man's infinite progress to perfection must still be infinite progress towards pain? Is it true that in the distant ages as man advances still further and further to the very glory, and perfection, and completion of his being, he must advance still more and more to the keener agonies of martyrdom? Is the crown of completion that science has to offer to humanity, so largely and so necessarily a crown of thorns? This is not a happy prospect; this is not altogether a gospel for humanity. But this is not all; this is not the strangest part of the mystery of man's unhappiness. The strangest thing connected with the unhappiness of man is this: that he differs from all other creatures which we know of in this respect, that he is often unhappy directly in proportion to the degree and extent to which he obeys his own nature. Consider this for a moment. All animals that we know of, save man, seem to be subject to this twofold law. Each animal has its instincts, its desires, its appetites, and in the climate or element in which it exists there are corresponding objects of gratification for those appetites and those desires. Given the concurrence of these two; given the appetite that craves; given the object that satisfies that appetite, and the animal is perfectly happy in itself, and needs no more. It has the portion of goods that falleth to it, and it, therefore, desires and seeks no more. Now, rise from the animal to the man; pass on, as we are told life has passed, by slight and imperceptible gradations, from the lowest to the highest stage of animal existence to the human animal, in which there is but a slight anatomical difference of structure and nature between the anthropoid creature and man, and then you come to the strange fact that this law is altogether reversed; you come to deal with a creature who is, as I have said, eminently unhappy, just because he has obeyed the strongest impulses, and largely enjoyed the gratification of the instincts of his being. We know that this is so, and we know the true source of pain is that he tastes and enjoys, and fulfils the strongest appetites of his nature. He is pained

from two different causes, ad they are mighty factors in the pain of suffering humanity. One is the pain of satiety, and the other the pain of remorse. Give the man all the portion of goods that can fall to him, or that in his wildest dreams of covetousness and ambition he can desire for himself; give him health, wealth, strength, keen intellect, vivid imagination, gratified ambitions; give him all these, and heap them on him in the abundance of wealth, and let him revel in the fulness of his enjoyment; and if human history and human experience tell us anything, they tell us this: that when he has enjoyed these to the very full, and just because he has enjoyed them, there begins to be felt a famine in his enjoyment, and there comes the weariness of satiety into his heart and soul. The eye is not satisfied with all its seeing, nor the ear with all its hearing, and weary, blaséd, and exhausted by the very pursuit of pleasure, which still something in him compels him to pursue, and draws him on and on in the pursuit, the man wearies of his very life. He feels that, somehow or other, his life does not consist in the abun- dance of the things he possesses. How is this? Why is this? How is it that you come to an animal—when you come to man—that the more its instincts are gratified, the more often it becomes unhappy? Mark again the other source of human sorrow and pain. It is the pain of remorse. How does it come to pass, when man obeys the strongest impulses and instincts of his nature he is not, like other animals, therefore happy, but therefore miserable? How is it when he does so, he does not, as we are told all other animals before him did, rise a step in the scale of creation, but that he sinks and knows he has sunk and fallen back towards the brute? What is the reason that when a man has yielded himself to some one or other of the strong appetites, the deep and inherent instincts and passions of his nature, there wakes up in him a feeling of shame, regret, and remorse; and why is it he is haunted by the furies of an accusing conscience? It is a strange fact, when you consider it in the true light of science, that when an animal, because he is an animal, does that which is natural, it becomes unhappy. Test this by a single case. Take a case in which you see some stronger brute dealing with a weaker one. Take the case in which you see some strong and savage man, who has just stamped out the life, cruelly and savagely, from the weaker creature whom he once vowed to cherish and protect. The strong animal stands beside the weaker, the very triumphant completion of the law of the survival of the strongest. The human race is being weeded of its weaker elements, as all animals thus might be, by violence. Why is it that deed of violence fills you with indignation in your soul, and you proceed to rebuke that man, and to charge him with having broken law? "What law?" he may ask you, "the law of society, the law that you have made for your convenience and your protection against my strength, what other law?' "The law of your nature," you will tell him.' "What law, and what nature?" My nature! Why what I have done is natural, or else I could not have done it. It was because my nature moved me to do this that I have done it, and why do you tell me it is unnatural? You appeal to my conscience. My conscience has proved itself feebler than that passion or that instinct which has overmastered my sense of right and wrong to which you appeal. In the name of science, then, in the name of purely materialistic science, which knows of nothing but force, I maintain and plead that this force in me which you call conscience, has not the right to rule, has not the scientific right to command. It has proved itself the weaker element in my nature by the very fact that it has given way. Why, then, am I, at your bidding, to mutilate one part of my being by placing it in subjection to another? How can you dare to tell me that I am not the new type of future humanity, stronger and fiercer than yourself, and therefore all the more likely to survive? I am in the minority now, and so has ever been the type of the new creature, in the exercise of its new and nascent strength. What is there in me that you can point out to me, and say by virtue of this fact, you are doing that which is unnatural and wrong? You might as well blame the balance because it inclines to the heaviest weight, or blame the chain because it snaps at its weakest point." There is the plea of the natural man who is obeying his nature, and although his plea is scientifically unanswerable, there is that within him which is answering him all the while, fitfully and intermittently, it may be, in proportion to the strength of those very instincts and passions to which he naturally gives way, but is never, perhaps, entirely silences. There is a voice within him which weakly pleads at some times, powerfully at others, which tells him that what he is doing is evil, unnatural, deadly to his own nature; the voice of conscience that will sting him with the scorpions of remorse, and haunt him with the the shame of memory, and that will plead, and yet plead in vain, as some discrowned and dethroned monarch pleads in vain, for his legitimate rule against his revolted subjects; and the man will feel and know this, and he will know too that he cannot bring one part of his nature into subjection to that which claims to rule the rest. He will tell you "I am unhappy because of this very disturbance and contest in my nature between the law which claims to be supreme and fails to prove its supremacy, and the appetites that are ever proving their right to rule by the very fact that they dethrone my better nature and rule me. 'Oh wretched man that I am, who will deliver me from the law in my members' which has subdued and conquered the better law in my mind and which is bringing me into captivity to what I feel and know to be the law of sin and death?" This is the misery of man, this is the strange, exceptional misery of man, and with this fact we confront

the teachers of the new Gospel for humanity, the Gospel of materialism, the Gospel which weighs and measures, and calculates the forces of matter, and tells us that these are all. We confront them — those who maintain that men are the orderly and the necessary product of laws which rule all matter — we confront them with these facts; we say, explain to us, if you can, the strange difference between this human automatic animal and all other animal automata with which you are acquainted? Tell us what is wrong with this machine, which should be the very perfection of all machines, tell us why its movements are so incalculable, so erratic, so violent at times, and so self-destructive? Can you explain to us this strange disorder and contest between its constituent elements and forces, can you lay your hand on this or that part of it, and say, here is the evil, and not there? Or can you, at least, even ignorantly, try to amend it: can you put to rights the machine, if you cannot explain it? Can you make it keep temperate time and measure, and do that work in the world which you believe, but which you have no scientific reason for believing, that it was meant and designed to do? If you cannot do this—and at any rate you have never yet attempted to do it—if you cannot do this, then stand aside for a moment or two, while we bring before you what we believe to be the truth concerning it. Hear what we have to say, we believers in the supernatural, we obsolete theologians: listen for a moment or two to our theory, on which we try to account for these facts: listen to us while we tell you what we at least try to do with this machine. The Bible theory concerning man is not that of continued and uninterrupted progress, though it is a theory of progress, but it is a theory of interrupted progress. The Bible theory of man is this, that he is not his true self, that he is a creature not in his proper and and true element. What the Bible tells us concerning man is this, that he differs from all other creatures in the universe, not in a fine and imperceptible degree, but in kind: not in anatomical differences of structure, but in this essential difference, that the God who made him, whether it were by an instant act of creation, or by an infinitely protracted creative act of evolution, in the hour when He produced man on the earth, He made him and fashioned him in His own image, and gave him that mystery of mysteries, a spiritual nature, with a free and self-determining will; and that it is the nature of this spirit of man that only in communion with, and obedience to, the Spirit which made it, can it find its true happiness; that the only place where he can be happy, if he can attain to it, if he can find it, is the Father's home. It tells us more. It tells us that it has been the curse and the disorganisation of the nature of man, that in the exercise of this strange and mysterious spiritual power of which I have spoken, the power of free will, he has wandered away from the Father's home, and claimed the selfish and solitary possession of the goods that the Father lavished upon him. It tells us that the origin of all human sin and sorrow has been this, that he has said, "Give me the portion of goods that falleth to me," give me the wealth of the imagination, the treasures of the affections, the strength of the intellect, give me all that makes me and glorifies me as a man, let me carry all these away into the far country of selfish possession and enjoyment without God. The Bible tells us that man's misery is the result of this vain effort to do in this world of God without the God who made him; that his weariness comes from this; that all the immense *ennui* of life, all the wretchedness of satiety that makes man from time to time, and now more than ever, ask—"Is life worth the living?" is but the sublime discontent of the soul that was made to rest in its God, and cannot rest in anything less than God; the soul that was made to find its peace and enjoyment, its aliment and sustenance in the infinite God, and cannot rest and cannot satisfy itself until it finds peace in the infinite. This is the Bible explanation of the satiety of man, and of the remorse of man when the lower part of his nature conquers the higher. It tells him that which nothing else can tell him, that which no scientific or anatomical analysis of his nature, no human psychology, can ever prove to him, that the voice within him that claims a sovereignty is the voice of the rightful sovereign; that the voice of conscience is nothing less than the echo of the voice of God; that the claim of this discrowned and dethroned monarch to rule is a rightful claim; that it lost its power to rule when the spirit of man revolted against God, its ruler, and lost thereby its command over its own lower vassals, the appetites which rise in perpetual rebellion and strife against it, but is still the rightful monarch; and that the misery of his soul comes from this revolt of his nature; that he is not a true man when he is miserable; that it is because he is living in an element unsuited to him that he is unhappy. It tells him more than this. It tells him that which revelation alone can tell him, that there is a remedy for his unhappiness. "Rise up and go to your Father." The far country in which you are dwelling must ever be swept again and again by periodic famine, as the soul in you, the immortal soul, fails to find its life, its sustenance, there. The swine-husks of sensual pleasure were made for lower animals in creation, they were not made for your spirit. Come to thyself; return to thy better and saner self, rise up and go to thy Father, and there find the rest, there find the peace, and there find the harmony and the reunion of all thy being, there gain the power to make thyself a true and perfect man; there become in very deed what thou wast made to be, the very crown and the very perfection of all creation, because, thou hast regained the lost image of the perfect One. Now, we are not afraid to contrast these two theories, theory for theory, idea for idea. We are not ashamed to say

—we unhesitatingly do say—that our theory includes all the facts, and gives at least a consistent account and hypothesis for those facts; and that the other does not. But is that all that we have to say?

Are these but theories against theories? Are we but opposing a dream with a dream when we set the dream of the scientist against the dream of the religionist? Not so. Our religion is a historical religion. It bases itself upon one life in the past; it is ever renewing and revealing itself in many lives ever since that life was lived on earth. It bases itself on one life, and that life was a perfect life, the life of One who, all through his existence, as far as we can know it—and the story of His life, if we accept it as true at all, reveals to us the very innermost workings and thoughts of that soul and heart—a perfect life, a life unstained by impurity, a life unvexed and unharassed by sensual or evil impulses, it was a life that was passed in entire and complete obedience to the will of the Father. His, therefore, was a soul that never knew the hunger of the exiled and rebellious son, because it was "meat and drink to Him to do His Father's will;" and He who gives us this picture of human unhappiness as consisting in the wandering from the Father's home was Himself the most perfectly-obedient Son. And that is not all. That life which He lived, that perfect life of obedience—of which all its sorrow only came from without, and only came from the fact that all around Him were not like Him, equally obedient—that life, He tells us, He can supernaturally give to us. "I am come that ye might have," not knowledge of your condition, which any moralist may give you; not statements of your nature, which any philosopher may try to give you, but "life," new life. "I am come that ye might have life, and have it more abundantly." And He who promises us this restoring, this healing, and this unifying life, Who promises it to us as a supernatural gift, what attestation does He give us of His claim to give this supernatural new life? He gives us this attestation, the miracles of His own life, not merely the miracle of His own existence, which might be a solitary and exceptional existence, but the miracles of His healing and restoring in the domain of the natural. He tells us, "You who might otherwise believe that you are the subjects of material law, and vainly struggle to free yourselves from the over-mastering tyranny of your nature, see what I have done in the region of the natural, and learn to trust me, as men bring to me those suffering from physical disease and agony, and I heal them with a touch. Look at me, those of you who are vexed with storms in your own souls, and see how that, with a word, I have stilled the storms of nature. Look at me, you who feel the utter helplessness of your resistance against all evil, you who feel as if you were dead bodies, swathed in the terrible habits that bind you, the very swathing clothes of the grave, of corruption, of sin. Look at me, as you see that young man carried out to the grave, amid the mournings of his mother—as mothers have mourned over young men dead in trespasses and sins—look at me as I say, "Young man, arise," and as you listen to that voice, and as you know that it is the voice that has stilled the storm and waked the dead, learn to trust in Him, as He tells you: "I have power to still the storm in your heart, to heal the disease in your nature, and to wake you from the grave of sin and death." And in the last place we have this fact to allege, that all along the history of the divine society which He came on earth to found, we have instances of this restoring and this healing power. We do not say—it were unjust and untrue to say—that all Christians have been moral and able to subdue their nature. It would be equally unjust to say that all materialists have been immoral, and have yielded to their nature. But what we do say is this, that all along the history of Christianity there are instances of recovery that are sudden, and are supernatural to all appearance. All through the history of Christianity, where the word and the name of Christ is preached, we do meet with the miracle of regeneration and conversion. We do find that men rise up suddenly and go to the house of their Father, and there they declare that they have received a strength and a blessing that they never knew before. All down the ages—ringing clear and distinct, loud above all the cries of human strife, and human sin, and human misery—there comes to us the litany of the penitent, there comes to us the joyful hymns of the reconciled. We hear and we see—thank God that we can so see—how suddenly drunkards become sober, outcasts chaste, profligates pure, churls bountiful, merciful, loving and kind! and we see that this is attributed by each one and all, to this fact, that they have heard that voice, that they have risen and gone to the Father, that they have been restored. Yes, men may mock at all this, they may tell us that the "Father's house" is all a dream, that the Father has no existence; but the robe and the ring with which the returning prodigals are clothed and adorned are facts which they cannot deny. The comely robe of righteousness that suddenly covers a man, the jewels and priceless gifts of adornment that are suddenly seen sparkling in his life, these are facts, patent and visible facts; and it is not scientific, it is not philosophic, to ignore such facts in the history of human experience and human life. We say, then, that our theory, the old Gospel theory—that Bible theory of the fall, and restoration, and deliverance of man—is the theory which best accords with the facts, the facts of man's nature, the facts of Christian experience, the facts of human life. And if that be so, if this word, "arise and go to thy Father" is a divine word, and if this word has been fortified by divine facts all along the sad history

of mankind, oh, brethren, you who hear me here to-day; you who are gathered here together on this day in which we celebrate the first coming upon earth of Him who told this story to glad ears then, and Whose story has sounded again and again in the ears of suffering and sorrowful mankind since then; you who are gathered here together, especially you, youth of this great University, who are gathered here in this home of science and of learning, to receive the portion of goods that falleth to each one of you; you who are here to gather up your share in the great inheritance of the ages, and to possess yourselves of talents and gifts, that you may use them for the glory and the progress of ages yet to come, heirs of the past, hope of the future, as you are, for you this comes to-day as a divine and a true word. Are there those here who know the reality of this word in their own spirits? Here where the young man, removed from the restraining, sanctifying influences of the father's home on earth, is sorely tempted to accomplish at least one-half of this old story, and to wander away from the Father's home in heaven. Here, where once and again in all its long history of successful effort, and crowned endeavour, there must have been, ever following these as their shadows, the stories of the wrecked and wasted life, of sad remorse and despair over opportunities cast away, and hopes that never could return—here, if there be one soul that hears me this day, one young heart that has known what it is to say, "I will arise and go to my Father, the mere gratification of the intellect has not satisfied my heart; the indulgence in sensual pleasures has degraded, but has not elevated my being; I am vexed with satiety, and I am wearied with remorse,"—if any such are here, they must have known this also, that in the hour when they went to the Father, they regained strength, that there was an hour of reconciliation, there was an hour of glad and kindly reception. Who that has ever fought the battle, not merely with the sin in the present, but the memory of sin in the past; who that has ever struggled against the defiled imagination; who that has ever fought a young man's brave battle with sin in the past or in the present, and then said, "In spite of all that can be said against it, I will try that old remedy, 'I will rise up and go to my Father,' nothing shall keep me back, no specious pleadings of the sceptical intellect; nothing shall keep me longer away from my Father, I will arise and go to Him;" who that has done this, I appeal to the experience of his heart and soul, and I ask—Have you not gained strength, have you not faced old memory, and have you not struggled against temptation in the sight of a new life? And if you did so, you had an experimental proof of the reality of the old faith, which is a more certain evidence than you can gain from books. You have tried the remedy, and it has redeemed your soul. And if there are those here who may not have tried this remedy, if there be those here who know, even in the opening of their manhood, something of the sadness and weariness that comes from indulged desires, or from penitent regret, and who are questioning in their own minds, "Is there any truth in all that teachers tell us of the fall and the restoration, of the disease and the remedy?" Oh, young man, whose feet are even now passing along the meeting-place of these two ways, the one leading to life, and the other to death, try but one step on the right way, try now, on this day, and let it be the very advent to your soul of your Lord and Saviour—try to trust His word, try to obey His teaching, and say, "I will arise and go to my Father, and say unto Him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before Thee."

THE TRIUMPHANT REIGN OF CHRIST.

By the late Rev. W. NIXON HOOPER, M.A.,
Minor Canon of Winchester Cathedral.

"Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this."—Isaiah ix. 7.

WHEN our Lord rode in triumph into Jerusalem—as if to assert His right to the title that was offered Him, and to the kingdom which He should one day occupy—He allowed hosannas to be addressed to Him by the multitude as King, and as Him who should restore the kingdom of their father, David.

Now the kingdom which the Jews thought Jesus was to establish was the literal kingdom of David. Had this expectation on their part been erroneous, it is inconceivable that Jesus should have suffered them to remain under so gross a delusion at the time when He was receiving homage from them in the very capacity of "King" over this kingdom.

Although, therefore, He left them uninformed of the time of the establishment of His kingdom, as He did those who on another occasion questioned Him on this subject (the times and the seasons not being for them to know), the transaction stands in manifest connexion with the prophecy of the text, with the announcement made by the angel Gabriel to Mary (Luke i. 32, 33), and with the inspired commentary of St. Peter, as recorded in the Acts (ii. 30), upon the words of David. In these passages we find a promise made to the Jews, and to David in particular, that of the fruit of his body a seed should be raised up to sit on his throne for ever. "God," saith St. Peter, "had sworn with an oath unto David, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, He would raise up Christ to sit on his (David's) throne."

With the throne of Christ is associated His kingdom. The period of their erection, and the term of their duration, are the same. "Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with

judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever." "The Lord God," said the angel, "shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end." The reign of Christ is, in fact, the development of the promise given to Adam in paradise, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head; it is the fulfilment of that made to Abraham, that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. With the reign of Christ, therefore, events of the greatest moment are connected. The whole world is interested in it; for He is to be the King over all the earth, and that dispensation will witness the conversion and salvation and blessedness of all nations.

When, however, we read the history of Jesus of Nazareth, we find that His first coming was not to triumph, but to suffer; not to reign, but to redeem. We are, therefore, yet to look forward to His second Advent for the accomplishment of the final purposes of God's grace in the universal blessedness promised to mankind under the dominion of Messiah.

In order to understand this aright, it will be necessary to take a brief survey of the *past* dispensations of God towards our world, in contrast with that which is still the subject of prediction.

It has pleased God, at different periods of the world, to dispense, or deal out, the knowledge of His will and the blessings of His favour, in different manners, suited to the state and circumstances of mankind. The phrase "a dispensation of religion" may accordingly be understood to mean a revelation of some part of the Divine will, accompanied by the performance of a corresponding portion of the Divine plan. Now a part of that plan which, it is manifest, the Almighty had in view from the beginning concerning this world was that, at some particular period, known only to Himself, and kept in His own power, all the families of the earth should be blessed with the true and saving knowledge of God, and the great enemy of God and man should be bruised under the seed of the woman. The promises made to Adam and Abraham, already mentioned, sufficiently establish this point.

But now observe the progress of God's dispensations in the accomplishment of this plan. He did not, to quote the language of the Son of Sirach (Eccles. xxxvi. 7, 8), "take away the adversary, destroy the enemy, and make the time short." He did not constitute Eve the immediate mother of the promised seed, and thereby destroy the serpent at once, and make a short work upon earth. No. The promise was given, but the performance of the thing promised was delayed. Meanwhile, however, some few of the families of the earth were blessed: they believed the promise; through faith they became interested in the benefit of its yet future accomplishment; and being influenced by the blessing, they "walked with God." But the bulk of the inhabitants of the earth were still under the curse, led captive by Satan at his will, and working all uncleanness with greediness.

This state of things continued till "the wickedness of man" became so "great in the earth" that the Lord destroyed the guilty race, saving only the small family of His servant Noah. At that time the promise to Adam, instead of being fulfilled, or in apparently progressive fulfilment, seemed to be forgotten. Nay more, it seemed to be contradicted. But God's thoughts are not our thoughts; neither is His mode of proceeding to be judged of by what seems right and suitable to us.

Further. When God called Abraham, and told him that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed, He did not make Sarah the mother of the promised seed. Here again, as before, the promise was given, but the performance was delayed. In the meantime God separated to Himself a people, a peculiar nation; and gave them in types and prophecies clearer and clearer instruction respecting the execution of His plan. Some believed: through faith they became interested in the promise, which yet tarried for its accomplishment; and, influenced by the same faith, they too "walked with God;" but the bulk of even the favoured nation, and all the rest of mankind, remained still under the curse. Israel rebelled against the Lord; rejected His counsel; despised and persecuted His messengers. In heavy displeasure the Almighty then cut them off from their privileges, destroyed their temple and city, and delivered them into their enemies' hand. All this while the promise to Abraham, so far from being accomplished, scarcely seemed to be in course of accomplishment: the families of the earth, instead of being blessed, lay still under the wrath and curse of God.

But His ways are higher than our ways. At length He sent forth His Son. And now the promised Seed was indeed come: but so unlike what had been expected; so unlike the powerful One who should bruise the serpent's head, and bless all the families upon earth, that few, very few recognized Him as the Seed: few, therefore, comparatively speaking derived any benefit from His coming; the nation at large rejected Him; and thus the accomplishment of the promise made to Abraham was partly brought to pass and partly delayed. The Seed was come; but the families of the earth were not yet blessed in Him. Then it was that in the wisdom of God true religion was extended to other people and nations. A further portion of the Divine plan was unfolded. Another dispensation was introduced. The glad tidings of salvation by the long predicted seed of the woman were proclaimed to the Greeks and Romans and other heathen nations, "that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ."

And now it seemed as though the glorious promises made to Adam and Abraham, and repeated by all the prophets, were about to be wholly fulfilled; the head of the serpent to be bruised; all the families of the earth to be blessed; and the whole world covered with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. The lesson, however, which all experience inculcates is this:

"Judge not the Lord by feeble sense."

He "is wonderful in counsel," and His "thoughts are very deep." (Isaiah xxviii. 29. Psalm xcii. 5.) We see that the Antediluvian Dispensation held out a prospect of the glorious promise of universal blessedness being fulfilled; but the time was not yet: that dispensation fell short of the accomplishment. We see that, in like manner, the Patriarchal and Levitical Dispensations held out with increasing clearness a prospect of the realization of the promise; but still the time was not yet fully come: these dispensations also fell short of it. Now we see our own dispensation encouraging yet livelier hopes and more vivid expectations of the entire fulfilment of the prophetic word. But let us receive instruction from what is past. Our dispensation, like preceding ones, may fall short of the glorious consummation; and another change may take place similar to the destruction of the world by the Deluge; similar to the rejection of the Jews: so that the present dispensation, like those that have gone before, shall be but introductory to a yet future and grander development of the Divine plan.

And this, we have abundant reason to believe, is the proper characteristic of the present dispensation. Christianity has now been promulgated for more than eighteen centuries; and we may say that not one family in the most favoured part of Christendom is yet in that state of blessedness in which all the families of the earth are to be found according to the promise. If we look to the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, at the 14th verse, we shall see the true design of the present dispensation. There God has told us distinctly, by the mouth of St. James, that the design of this dispensation is to take out from among the Gentiles a people for His name; which is a very different thing from converting and blessing all the families of the earth. Were it necessary, this statement of the Apostle might be illustrated by proofs drawn from the experience, the number, and the character of the true disciples of Christ, as largely described in the New Testament. But we must pass on to notice, as we proposed, a dispensation which is still the subject of prediction.

At the birth of our Saviour all the former prophecies were in substance renewed in the announcement made by the angel Gabriel to the Vigin mother. In the message which he was commissioned to deliver, we have an express intimation of the triumph and reign of Christ; an intimation which, I have already observed, was in no way verified at the Saviour's first advent; and which, if it be fulfilled at all, must be fiulfilled at His first coming. Indeed, Christ's glorious and blessed reign is the grand theme of prophetic anticipations. Besides the passages adduced at the opening of this discourse, let us attend to the following prophecy of Jeremiah (xxiii 5, 6): "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is His name whereby He shall be called, *The Lord our Righteousness*." Now that this applies to our Lord Jesus Christ, there can be no question. He was of the stock of David. He was altogether righteous in Himself. He was a King; for He was "born King of the Jews." Thus far the prophecy identifies His person. But has He reigned prosperously? that is, according to the common meaning of language, has He had the victory over His enemies? Has He had the satisfaction of seeing His subjects in the enjoyment of peace, plenty and happiness? So far from it, we know from the New Testament history that His enemies had the victory over Him: they "killed the Prince of life." It is true that, because of His personal dignity, (for He was a King), His enemies, and even death itself, could not hold Him: yet He did not effectually throw off His disguise as a servant, and confound His foes. On the contrary, He left them in the exercise of a mysterious and fearful liberty of continuing in their rebellion, if they will. Instead of seeing His subjects in the enjoyment of peace and prosperity, He told them distinctly that He was come at this time not to send peace upon the earth, but a sword: that they would be persecuted and cast out of the synagogues; and that the time was at hand when whosoever killed them would think that He did God service. He left them His peace, it is true, as a legacy; but it was the peace of endurance in the midst of sufferings. Moreover, it is predicted in the prophecy just quoted that He is to "execute judgment and justice in the earth." This likewise awaits a future accomplishment. Instead of establishing an ascendancy of righteousness in the earth, injustice, oppression, and violence prevail unto this day. And as respects Judah and Israel, so far from being "saved" and "dwelling safely," the sceptre was departed from Judah while our Lord was yet upon earth; and ever since, the Jews have been trodden down and degraded, the victims of wasting persecutions, and unparalled sufferings, utterly ruined in church and state, and scattered in disgrace among all nations to the present hour. Still we wait for the time when the Lord shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth; and when at length they shall, as a nation, acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth by His royal name, *The Lord our Righteousness*.

Thus we see that this prophecy of Jeremiah in connexion with our text has never yet up to this moment found a complete fulfilment. But shall it ever be fulfilled? Let the prophecy itself answer

that question: "Behold, thus saith the Lord," the Lord who cannot lie hath spoken it, and it must be fulfilled. In the words of our text, "the zeal of the Lord of hosts shall perform this."

But when? and in whom?—my brethren: all who receive the Scriptures as the word of God believe that Jesus Christ shall come again. He sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and from thence He shall come. He shall come in glory. Jeremiah's prophecy has already received a partial fulfilment in Him during His first advent; it will receive its complete accomplishment at His second. He has done what marks Him out as the Person predicted: He will yet do what will accomplish the things predicted. Then "the Lord God will give unto Him the throne of His Father David, and he shall reign over the House of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end.

This is the glorious and blessed consummation which the Scriptures teach us to anticipate. Jesus Christ will return, not in disguise, not as an infant of days, but with power and great glory. He shall be manifested as "King of Kings and Lord of Lords. He shall reign and prosper, executing judgment and justice in the earth. He shall subdue His enemies under Him, and bestow abundance of peace upon His friends; and all the families of the earth shall in that day be blessed in Him.

But ere this reign of righteousness begins, the nations are to be trodden in the winepress of the wrath of God. The same Scriptures which predict that Christ shall have the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession, also forewarn us that He shall rule the nations with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Passages too numerous to be cited agree in exhibiting Messiah in the twofold and associated character of the Redeemer and the Avenger; and in declaring that His kingdom will be ushered in by desolating and unexampled judgments; judgments which will descend upon false and merely nominal Christianity especially. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ;" on them who, having seen the light, love darkness rather than light, and receive not the love of the truth, because their deeds are evil. "The Son of Man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity." Apostate Christendom shall be the scene of vengeance.

The subject, thus viewed, is seen to be one pre-eminently calculated to alarm the sinner, to bring the counterfeit christian to tremble for his refuge of lies, and to lead the believer to cleave fast to the Rock of his salvation. Fearful times, it must not be concealed, await the nominal Christian Church; times pregnant with awful decisions and the prospect of which says loudly to all who bear the Christian name, "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith: prove your ownselves." Remember, brethren, that, in reference to the cause and service of Christ, there can be no such thing as neutrality: unless you are His devoted friends, He will count upon you as His enemies. Now He holds forth to you the sceptre of mercy; yet a little while and He will unsheath the sword of justice. Now is "the acceptable year of the Lord;" but, let it not be overlooked, this acceptable year introduces "the day of vengeance of our God." (Isaiah lxi., 3.) Flee therefore from the wrath to come; that wrath which is the accumulation of all the predictions of wrath from the beginning, and which will descend at last on the enemies of Christ. "Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him." Blessed indeed! for they may unite in the response of the beloved disciple to the Saviour's promise, "Surely I come quickly," and say "Amen, Even so, come, Lord Jesus." The terrific judgments which he had just been the instrument of announcing had no terrors for him; nor need they dismay the humblest believer in Jesus. Yet is not this petition for the Lord's coming too often left out of the prayers of Christians? Is not the Lord's advent too seldom prayed for by many who, we doubt not, do love the Saviour sincerely and above all? We plead for the coming of the kingdom, but not for the arrival of the King. Yet this, more than ever in these last days, ought to be the burden of our prayers: for truly, as Christians, we have many things to try us, and make us long for the Lord's appearing. We have the corruptible body pressing down the soul. (Wisdom ix., 15) We have opposition without and fears within. We have sin and error and defection in the Church. We have abounding iniquity in the world. We have beloved relatives and friends whom we have committed to the grave in certain hope of resurrection and reunion. Surely, my brethren, these things, enforced by unfeigned love to the person of the Saviour Himself, may well prompt the unceasing prayer for His return, and for the dawning of that cloudless day when the kingdom that cannot be moved shall be set up; when war and discord, confusion and hatred, shall cease for ever, and over this troubled world JESUS shall reign in righteousness and everlasting peace.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY DECEMBER 11, 1880.

WE insert criticisms on the Bishop of Peterborough's magnificent Sermon, not because we think them valid or conclusive, but because we desire to give an impartial hearing to arguments on both sides of this great question. For instance,

we do not agree with Mr. Voysey, that Society should forgive its offenders to a much greater extent than it does. We hold that there is and ought to be "a reign of Law" in the Moral just as there is in the Natural Kingdom. With the Bishop, we believe that "it is wrong for Society to submit to martyrdom; Society dare not, cannot, must not forgive its debtors." We see the fruits of such forgiveness now in Ireland; but when Parliament meets we shall be surprised and disappointed, if it does not hold the Executive responsible for all the terrorism; murders, and mutilations that have occurred in that unhappy country. We have also thought it one of the hallucinations of Mr. Gladstone, that this country should suffer martyrdom for the sake of other less-favoured nations, consequently he put this country to a vast expenditure in ceding the Ionian Islands to the Greeks, and more recently in demonstrating to enrich the Montenegrins.

SOME RULE OF LIFE.—I.

In dealing with the present subject, I think that it will be safe to assume, as a point on which all will be agreed, that practical holiness can never be either attained, or maintained, unless we have "Some Rule of Life." It is difficult to conceive of any one asserting that NO Rule is needed, especially when the growing self-indulgence, not to say corruption, of society is taken into the account.

Since, then, some "Rule of Life" is needed, what Rule shall it be? Is "every man to do that which is right in his own eyes?" Such a course would, I think, result, at the best, in a very desultory system of self-discipline. In most cases it would result in no discipline at all; and, as a matter of fact, that is pretty much the actual spiritual state of a very large number of average Christians. But, besides this, there is a special difficulty inseparable from this haphazard way of dealing with so grave a question—that it is not an easy matter for most people to frame rules for themselves. Some would be tempted to be over-lax; while others, in their conscientious desire to deal honestly with themselves, would be tempted to adopt rules of too severe a character. I have, in fact, had some experience of this latter danger. In the course of a good deal of correspondence on these questions, I have been obliged to insist on some relaxation of the severity with which earnest-minded persons have been disposed to deal with themselves. But, the truth is, if people would only be content to take up what lies directly in their path, there need not be any real difficulty at all. Such as the difficulty is, it is in great measure of our own making, because we are tempted to shut our eyes to the fact that there is a Rule ready made to our hand, if we will only look in the right place for it—I mean, in the Prayer Book. Of course, I am now referring to what may be called exterior rules. With the interior rules of each man's conscience, I do not propose to deal in these papers. The Reformed Church of England has laid down certain rules which it is in the power of all her members, Lay as well as Clerical, to keep; and the quiet, constant keeping of which would tide us over many a little fretting question of conscience, while it would greatly tend to strengthen our inner life. The rules to which I am alluding are the Church's law for the observance of her Festivals and Fasts. Now, we can all testify that the Festival-keeping has gone on steadily growing for the last half century. I need not dwell on details; only, let us thank God for all this spiritual growth, for it is His work, not ours; it is an evidence of His indwelling Presence in our dear Mother the Church of England. But does not the same Church of England which bids us keep her Festivals, bid us keep her fasts also? With that question I will close my present Paper, trusting to be permitted to pursue the subject in future numbers.

A COUNTRY VICAR.

THE ART OF READING AND SPEAKING.

By the Rev. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A.,
Vicar of Brigstock.

(Continued from page 583.)

Some one has well said, "If our work is to be well done, nine-tenths of it must be drudgery." This is to a very great extent true, and no doubt explains why so few of us read and speak well. There is no specific for transforming ordinary men, at a stroke, into extraordinary men. "There is no royal road to learning." We must all take the same sure course of plodding industry and steady perseverance which leads on to perfection. Nature has not done so much for us after all, and the thing which most distinguishes men from men is work. We say these things, because the rules that we are about to propose, as leading on to success, involve, more or less, labour.

Last week we tried, and we hope we succeeded, to shew that breathing is an art and an art that must be learnt. If it is an art, it is clear that we do not breathe well naturally. It is, however, not difficult to acquire, and may be acquired by most, if not by all. Mr. Spurgeon says "You need broad chests and must do your best to get them." If he means by this we must learn to breathe, he is right; but if he means a large apparatus is necessary, he is not quite accurate. We are not much the better for possessing a good organ unless its powers are well developed and we know how to make the best use of them.

But if, for the purposes of speech, we must learn to breathe, how can we do it? Here, by strict attention to little things. The things are so little and so simple that the fear is, we shall consider them beneath our notice We are so accustomed to be concerned with great things that the simplicity of little things is often their ruin. The little things are three, and, in order to attain our object, we must attend to each separately.

These are—(1) taking in the breath, which we may describe as inspiration, (2) holding the breath or reservation, and (3) letting out the breath or expiration. The perfection of each of these parts is necessary to the perfection of the art, and to that end must receive separate and individual attention. We must, in short, learn to inspire, reserve and give out—to take in stock, economise and expend it. In each of these arts our aim and object must be duration and control. All this may be accomplished by exercises which we now proceed to explain.

The first thing to do by way of exercise is this—stand upright, not bolt upright but easily. Let the arms hang by the sides, palms outwards. This serves, as you will observe, to expand the chest—a most important thing. The heels should be together and the toes out. In this position, take in the breath quietly and through

the nostrils. Why through the nostrils? Because this is the smallest avenue leading to the lungs, and then there is the axiom, "What we take in quietly we can give out quietly." We must never forget this, as it is most important; but while remembering it, we must act upon it. The stream of air must be very tiny and very long. We must aim at length of inspiration. We must fill up the lungs until there is no more room for another atom of air. It may cause a little pain at first and this is not a matter for surprise. The cricketer, after the first day's practice of the season, feels many aches and pains. There is reason for it. He has been exercising joints and muscles that have been idle for a long winter. And here, the vocal gymnast is calling into action muscles that not only have been idle for a short time, but, may be, have never been used before. The wonder would be, if there were no pains. There is, however not much to fear; it is only muscular, and will soon pass off. It is scarcely necessary, perhaps, to remind ourselves that we must seek power slowly and gradually and not train too violently at first.

We must here also remind ourselves—and it is a thing we must never forget—*that a deep inflation is the first condition of true vocal production.* For this reason, as well as for others which will soon manifest themselves, it is important to acquire facility in producing it. It has been well said, by a recent writer on this subject, "the best efforts of elocution and singing are produced from a full chest of air inspired according to the natural or abdominal (deep) type."

Our next object is to acquire power over the breath. We must learn to hold, to reserve it. We proceed to do this when we have taken it in after the manner just now described. We can say nothing about this part of the art of breathing further than this. We acquire the power of control by holding or reserving the breath. We must ourselves be the best judges of the length of time we can retain an inflation without letting any part of it go. The point to remember is that we must direct attention to this part of the art of breathing and this is the best and, so far as we can see, the only way.

The most difficult part to learn of the art of breathing is the third part, the part we have described, for want of a better name, *expiration.* Perhaps, some of us are ready to say, "I would rather, if you please, not learn that just now." Well, nonsense apart, it is difficult. For learning the other two parts of the art of breathing, there are no specific directions beyond those given; but for this there are many. A good exercise is to let the breath run out quickly through the nostrils after having taken it in and reserved it as we have indicated above. For performing this exercise as a whole, we may say, "Take the breath in slowly, and deep, through the nostrils. Hold it for a length of time. Give it out very slowly through the nostrils."

Here it will not be amiss to say two things about breathing through the nostrils. (1) Breathe as much as possible for the ordinary purposes of life through the nostrils. It will preserve the teeth, throat, and chest. This because the air will be warmed and filtered before it enters the lungs. We cannot make too much of breathing in this way. It is the way nature intended us to breathe, and it is better to follow her directions. And then it will save many a doctor's bill. (2) Breathe through the nostrils as often as possible when speaking. It is recommended by some, always to breathe through the nostrils. The advice would be very good if it were practicable, but it is not, and so it may as well be dismissed at once. How can a speaker, especially in impassioned speech, stop to take breath through the nostrils! The demands he makes on his lungs are too large and too frequent, he must take in his breath through his mouth. When, by practice he has learnt to fill his lungs, he has only to open his mouth and they are at once deeply inflated. And better, let us add, that they should be than he. The reason given for breathing in actual speech through the nostrils is that it prevents dryness in the mouth. Does it? Is it breathing or nervousness, anxiety, doubt, difficulty, danger, diffidence—kindred things all and too much allied also at times—or what, that causes dryness in the mouth? Let our readers decide and then they may also determine whether breathing through the nostrils is the right remedy. If it is, it will be because it takes the speaker's thoughts from himself. This is a great point, because it so often happens that, when he rises to speak, he is so much concerned with that illustrious personage that his matter immediately becomes too weighty and gravitates to his toes. But we are digressing. Let the speaker breathe through his nostrils, if he can, when speaking: he must make a point of doing it when he is practising.

We must never despise any piece of information that is useful. Here then is another exercise recommended by one who has given much attention to these things. Stand moderately erect and raise the arms up and let them down rapidly, pretty much in the fashion a fowl raises its wings when frightened and wants to fly. Continue the practice for some minutes daily.

We have already used as much space as we have at our disposal, and we must, therefore, leave till next week our notice of further exercises for acquiring the art of breathing. We may, however, say that we cannot give too much attention to this subject. We do not wish to produce stilted or inflated speakers and readers. Our object is simply to develop the powers nature—or better, Nature's God—has given us. We are doing our best to accomplish this, and so we conclude this paper by recommending our readers to pursue vigorously, not only what we have said, but also all sorts of gymnastic exercises—especially the use of the dumb bells or Indian clubs. Breath is the stuff of which vocal tone is made. We cannot be extensive producers unless we we have learnt to acquire, economise, and dispose of it.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH ON THE ATONEMENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I have read with some interest the correspondence respecting the Bishop of Peterborough's sermon. I read the sermon, too, and felt that it was not altogether satisfactory. I do not ask, Mr. Editor, for space to go into the whole question, but only for permission to say a few words.

To my mind, then, it is a fallacy which must lead to wrong results to institute a comparison between man and man, and man and God, and argue from it. The difference is so great, and the conditions can never be the same. "When I consider the heavens, the moon and stars which Thou hast made, what is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the Son of Man that Thou so regardest him!"

Man has no right to feel that he has enemies, however great their offences, that he must hate. He must love

all and be a neighbour to all who need his help. "Love your enemies." "Bless them that curse you." To all this he willingly submits on his full acceptance of Christianity. It follows, indeed, as effect follows cause. He forgives, because he is forgiven, not because he will be forgiven.

How, then, is man reconciled to God? This must always be considered as a clear and distinct question. It must not be mixed up with anything respecting his relation to his fellow-man. To answer it fully and clearly, it appears to me that we must always remember that God's attributes are all infinite. His justice is infinite. His mercy is infinite. These are in conflict, so far as man is concerned, till the Atonement steps in and reconciles them. Then and there "mercy and truth are met together—righteousness and peace have kissed each other."

We have nothing to do, as it appears to me, with the rationale of this arrangement. It should be sufficient for us to know "that God can now be just and yet the justifier of the unjust." These old truths have been too much forgotten in these days of boasted progress. Men forget that God's truth cannot advance. It has always been perfect. They forget also that man's relation with God does not change.

Mr. Voysey's propositions look very fair on reading them over; but after examination, they are found to be simply untrue. J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brighton Vicarage, Dec. 7th, 1880.

—: o :—

THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

SIR,—When I asked you to allow me to disclaim an exposition, to which by an accident my name had been attached, I had no thought of entering into a controversy. But as the two letters which my remarks have called forth seem fairly entitled to an acknowledgment, I should like to express my satisfaction at being assured that what I found fault with was rather a verbal than a substantial error. Of Dean Bagot's orthodoxy I had no doubt, if I may say so without impertinence; and I observe that neither he nor his zealous apologist, Mr. Montgomery, attempts to defend the phraseology of the passage to which I took exception—a passage which is evidently self-contradictory, and, as the lawyers say, "not agreeable," inasmuch as it represents an *original, essential*, and *eternal* possession of the Godhead as capable of being *resumed*, and consequently of being *laid aside*. The whole mischief lies in the introduction of the word "resume," which in this connection has no counterpart nor sanction in Scripture.

I cannot help thinking that both my courteous respondents would have left unwritten some things which they have penned, had the theological bearings of the matter been more familiar to them. In that case the Dean would probably not have done violence to our Lord's declaration by transferring it from His Person to His glory, nor have assumed that I employed the words "equal" and "greater" with reference to Nature, when I expressly referred them to Personality; nor have called an interpretation, generally current among the Fathers, and one of the common-places of theology, *my* "proposed explanation" (as well might the theory of gravitation be spoken of as my proposed explanation of the solar system). Again, Mr. Montgomery would probably not have thought of clearing up the matter by protesting against the Eutychian heresy, which is not even remotely concerned in it; nor would he have done me the honour of quoting my words as Hooker's and using them as such in support of the Dean. And once more, neither he nor the Dean would have been likely to appeal to the Athanasian Creed, as conclusive of the interpretation to be put on the passage under discussion.

BROWNLOW MAITLAND.

—: o :—

The Rev. Charles Voysey desires the following corrections to be made in his Letter of last week:—On page 585, line 16 of second column, "entire" instead of "active" and on line 40, "pool" instead of "port."

At Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, the Rev. Morgan W. Jellett, LL.D., was installed as Canon by the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, acting as Dean. A Chapter was held after Divine service, when Dr. Jellett took his seat as a member of the capitular body. The members of the Chapter present were the Archbishop, the Ven. L. H. Streane, Rev. Precentor Seymour, Rev. Chancellor Tisdall, Rev. the Treasurer Monahan, Rev. Canons Greene, Finlayson, Burton, and Hamilton. Mr. William Maffett, Registrar, was in attendance.

The first of the announced series of Oratorios in St. Patrick's, Dublin, was given on Tuesday evening, the 30th of November, when the *Messiah* was performed, with a numerous and carefully-trained chorus, Mr. C. Marchant presiding at the organ. The Cathedral was densely crowded in every part, and the Oratorio was preceded by a short service.

The Rev. J. P. Sandlands, vicar of Brigstock, gave a course of four lectures last week in the Divinity Hall, Durham, to members of the University on the Art of Public Speaking. He was listened to with marked attention, while he carefully explained the principles which it, as an art, involves. It was generally felt that the lecturer's way of putting things deserved attention, as it could not fail of producing satisfactory results.

—: o :—

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alsop, Rev. Arthur R., vicar of Acton Trussell and Bednall.
Blackburne, Rev. Henry J., rector of Warmingham; honorary canon of Chester Cathedral.
Danks, Rev. G. W., curate of Holy Trinity, Gainsborough; vicar of Morton, Gainsborough.
Hutchinson, Rev. C. R., vicar of Pilstone; vicar of Eddlesborough, Bucks.
Matthews, Rev. James, S.A.C., Canterbury, rector of St. Mark's, Warwick, Queensland; Archdeacon of Warwick.
Powell, Rev. T., curate of Probus, Cornwall; vicar of Ramsgill, Yorks.
Ranken, Rev. Arthur, incumbent of St. Drostane's, Deer, and synod clerk of Aberdeen and Orkney; dean of the United Diocese.
Robinson, Rev. Arthur J., vicar of St. John's, Waterloo-road; rector of Whitechapel.
Silver, Rev. Edgar, rector of Medstead; vicar of Highfield (Portswood), Southampton.
Thomas, Rev. Henry, Hardingly College, Hayward's-heath; general preacher in the diocese of Chichester.
Tufnell, Rev. Frederick, rector of Fryerning.
Warman, Rev. J. S., vicar of Blackmoor, Alton, Hants.
Whitting, Rev. William Henry, rector of Stower Provost; rural dean of the First Portion of the Deanery of Shaftesbury.

—: o :—

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Hunter, Rev. Henry, at the Vicarage, Griston, Norfolk, vicar of Griston, sometime of British Guiana, and for many years of Warboys, Huntingdon, on the 30th ult., aged 72.
Goldham, Rev. Richard, M.A., at Lee, Kent, on the 1st inst. aged 63.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED FAITH.

By the Ven. ARCHDEACON REICHEL, D.D., Canon of St. Patrick's, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin.

Sermon Preached in St. Patrick's Cathedral on Sunday, Nov. 21st, 1880.

"I found it necessary to write to you, exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints."—St. Jude 3.

THE Epistle of St. Jude is one of the most curious, in some respects one of the most important documents which compose the New Testament. It was written in all probability by a half-brother of our Saviour: one of those brethren of His who were so slow to believe in Him at first, so firm in believing afterwards. It was written chiefly to guard against libertinism; the libertinism of presumption, which the author saw would soon go on to the doctrinal libertinism which is censured by his copyist, the author of the 2 Epistle of St. Peter. It quotes the aprocryphal book of Enoch, a book now known to be a nearly contemporary forgery, and thereby gives instructive hints as to the real nature of Inspiration.

In citing my text, I have not adhered to the Authorised Version. That Version was never meant to take in our Church the place to which the Latin Vulgate has been elevated in the Church of Rome. Its marginal readings, without which no copy of the English Bible is complete, confess that the translators could not always make up their minds, and therefore that their work is imperfect. No law except the law of custom and convenience binds us to read out the Lessons from it; and it would be dealing deceitfully with the Word of God, if preachers were to adhere slavishly to words which do not convey the sense of the writers. Thus here: the faith *once* delivered to the Saints, of which the Authorised Version speaks, might be only the faith formerly delivered to the Saints. But the faith *once for all* delivered to the Saints means more than this. It means that the faith is not merely *historic*, but *unalterable*. Let us see what this unalterable faith is, on which St. Jude lays so much stress.

The word "faith" in this passage, as in several others, plainly means the body of facts or teaching which is to be believed. Thus Paul exhorts prophets or preachers, to prophesy or preach according to the proportion of the faith, to give each doctrine its due importance, not suppressing any one part in order to bestow undue prominence upon another.

I will not weary you by citing all the passages where the word faith unquestionably bears this sense. But it is important you should perceive that the word faith does bear this sense, because a notion is now extensively diffused, that "faith," in the New Testament, means only a certain mental disposition, a disposition to trust God or Christ, without any settled body of doctrine or of fact, being necessary for the exercise of such disposition. Numbers now make the whole of religion consist in a vague sense of trust and confidence; the universal Fatherhood of God, the universal Brotherhood of Man, are the two cardinal points of this new belief; the miraculous facts narrated in the Gospels, the Incarnation, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Saviour; His death as a victim, and not as a martyr only: the promise of His future coming again to judge the world, as well as His present mediatorial reign over the world, have disappeared from their consciousness; and consequently the whole character and acts of Christ are enveloped in a kind of luminous haze, compounded at once of respect and unbelief, in which all distinct outline vanishes. The necessary outcome of this system may be seen in the writings of a celebrated living critic. This writer, who understands St. Paul much better than St. Paul understood himself, talks of our Saviour's Resurrection as being to St. Paul nothing more than a death to sin and a rising again to righteousness, such as that symbolized by baptism: a mere moral change expressed in physical language. The Fatherhood —the very Being—of God dissolves in his manipulation into an "Eternal Something that makes for righteousness:" the Divine authority of Jesus into "a sweet reasonableness" which one finds it difficult to reconcile with the claims to obedience he made, if he were only a sweetly reasonable Jew. What kind of support views like these can give to minds perplexed by the strange phenomena of visible existence or distressed by the consciousness of that internal discord which St. Paul has so vividly depicted in Romans vii, I cannot see, and accordingly persons who hold such views will act as the the Priest and the Levite when spectacles of moral degradation or spiritual dereliction rudely assault their delicacy; they will "pass by on the other side." The proof of the folly of these and of similar theories, now trumpeted forth as the last discoveries of science or of criticism, is their absolute impotency. They do not touch the heart, they cannot rouse the will, they cannot inspire the conduct. And do you think that such notions are peculiar to the latter part of the 19th century? Was dying to sin, and living to righteousness, so new an idea that Paul could proclaim it as a new message—a gospel of salvation? My brethren, this merely moral preaching has been tried and has failed in the hands of men infinitely transcending these modern philosophasters in energy of thought and in power

of expression. These or the like things are the essence of the gospel of Plato, save that in him indeed, they were accompanied by the most vivid anticipation of that future life of which the modern apostle of culture regretfully despairs. And what effect did they produce in Plato's hands? What was the state of the Gentile world when Christ was born, leavened as it had then been by four hundred years of Plato's teaching? Turn to the first chapter of the Romans, if you want an answer; turn to those classics of the Augustan age which bear out every word of the awful indictment brought by Paul in that chapter. There you may see in what the gospel of culture ended; what were the moral results of all this refined and elevated speculation, which was speculation only; there you will see how much was contributed to the raising and ennobling of the human race by mere philosophy, unaided by a Higher Power. The passions of mankind laugh to scorn the restraining influence of culture; nay, if culture be all that we can invoke to bridle them, they will make culture and philosophy itself subservient to their indulgence and deification as they did of old. Rome and Latium were pure so long as philosophy and culture were unknown; it was the irruption of the highest civilization and literature, æsthetically speaking, the world has ever seen, that first corrupted the rude but majestic simplicity which made Roman arms the ruler, and Roman law the arbiter of the world. It was when "captive Greece took captive her fierce foe," that horrors of vice for which we have no name were introduced into the Empire city, till at length triumphant Lust sate impersonated on the throne, robed in the Imperial purple, and swaying the sceptre of absolute and universal power.

The danger against which I am warning you is the danger of discarding all definite belief in the effort to discard wrong beliefs. No doubt we have been too long enthralled by the subtleties of mediæval thought. Too long have we, following in the steps of the schoolmen, treated the Bible as a repertory of texts, each independent of any other, and from which might be deduced a complex system of dogmatic theology, accurately stating and satisfactorily solving all the inscrutable problems which underlie existence. The origin of evil, its purpose in the universe, its purpose in the history of man—these problems, which form the real subject of the reasonings of the Book of Job, but which, though fully stated, receive no answer there, except that which is contained in the significant fact that God Himself, when at length He speaks, declines to answer them,—these problems had exercised the splendid but gloomy genius of St. Augustine from his youth. He had at first sought an explanation of them in dualism, or the doctrine of two equal and opposing deities, one good and one evil, to whom the strange mixture of good and evil in the world and in man was due. When dualism failed to satisfy his reason, when he saw that there cannot be two Gods —two independent and underived and necessary Creators—he sought a solution of the problem of evil and sin in a theory hardly less blasphemous, in the supposed predetermination of the Omnipotent, who was thus made the Author of Evil for His own glory. Augustine's Manichæan tendencies, however, were not completely overcome. They reappeared in the supposition that evil was immortal: that those addicted to its power would never really die, and that an eternal rebellion against the Omnipotent would perpetuate itself for ever in the agonies of hell, where Satan and those given up to Satan, though bound in chains of darkness and reduced to powerlessness, would still keep up their old hatred of God and goodness, and would bar Him out of their hearts, so that "God" would not be "all in all." This theory, whose logical attractions have for ages counterbalanced its moral horrors as well as the express words of Scripture I have quoted, was generally accepted in the Western Church; and its influence, instead of diminishing, became greater at the Reformation in the rugged vehemence of Luther and the remorseless logic of Calvin. Stated in all its harshness by the former, carried out unflinchingly through the whole Gospel by the latter, the assertion of the eternal continuance of evil, as due to the eternal purpose of the Omnipotently Good, became the creed of reformed Christianity, and we are only now beginning to emerge from its baleful shadow. But, in emerging from it, as I hope we are, there is danger that we may go too far in the opposite direction; that in discarding what are, after all, only theosophic speculations engrafted on God's Word, we may discard positive and clear statements of that Word. The blasphemous assertion that God has created evil for His own glory, the grotesque suggestion that the sight of the eternal torture of the damned may be necessary to secure the eternal allegiance of the saved, may easily swing round, on the one hand, into the denial of God's Omnipotence, which is tantamount to the denial of His sole underived existence; on the other hand, into the denial of any future punishment whatever. Or, in another direction, we may be tempted to that solution of the dark mystery of evil which was proposed by Spinoza, whose philosophy is the real root of all the philosophic systems of the present day, such as they are. To that great thinker there is but one real substance, God. All the phenomena of which we know anything are only modes of two out of the infinite number of His infinite attributes, and as these modes develop themselves by the internal necessity of God's existence, all that exists must have existed precisely as it does exist, and in no other manner. Whatever is, is therefore right. This system obviously destroys morality quite as effectually as the predestinarian theory does. For whether all be fore-ordained by the decree of God, or all be inherently necessary by the development of God, makes no real difference. There is no place for free-will and con-

sequent moral responsibility in a world where all is thus reduced to mechanism. From whichever source flows fatalism and mechanism, whether from supposed pre-ordination by a Power outside us, or from natural necessity within us, the two systems run up into the same result, with this difference only, that the one acknowledges sin, though it really ascribes it to God, the other denies sin, because it makes it a part of God.

To another point on which correction of mediæval notions is absolutely necessary, we are led, as I before remarked, by the Epistle of St. Jude. The schoolmen mostly held that every word of Scripture was exactly true in exactly the same way as every proposition in Euclid is. We all recollect the history of the proceedings of the Inquisition against the great Italian astronomer, because he had ventured to assert that the earth goes round the sun, and not the sun round the earth. These proceedings were based on the literal interpretation and acceptance of a poetic passage in the Book of Joshua, which was never intended to teach astronomy. In exactly the same way, long after the name of Galileo had become a watchword, the statements of the first chapter of Genesis were habitually construed in all their apparent literal rigour as intended to teach us that this earth at least, if not the whole solar and stellar systems, was created in six days; and on this was based the doctrine that it is absolutely necessary to observe, not the seventh day, but the first day of the week as a Sabbath, in memory of the rest of the Creator after his work was over! The genealogies in the Book of Genesis were taken as complete records of all the generations intervening between Adam and Noah, forgetting the fact that the genealogies of our Lord in St. Matthew and St. Luke are confessedly defective, and omit many known members of the long series of His ancestors; and on this slight basis was built a chronology of man which still keeps its place in too many Bibles, misleading children and offering a stumbling-block to older persons. The root of all these errors was that inspiration was confounded with infallibility; and the sacred writers were represented, not as mentally guided by the Holy Spirit according to their own capacities and the exigencies and possibilities of the times in which they wrote, but as mere mechanical amanuenses, taking down the very words dictated to them by the Holy Ghost. Thus the whole meaning and drift of a great portion of the Bible was lost; it was taken not as a history of the gradual training of a portion of the human race until that "fulness of time" should come when it should be ripe for the Revelation of God in the person of His Son; but as an absolute and perfect declaration of the absolute mind of the Supreme, irrespective of the changing needs and of the manifold imperfections of the men by whom it was written and to whom it was addressed. It is obvious that had the Bible spoken the language of scientific precision, had it anticipated the discoveries of the present day, it would have been absolutely unintelligible to the generations for whom it was first intended, and would, probably, have been instantly rejected by them as an absurd imposture. It was and always will be necessary to feed babes with milk; and the doubts thrown on the Divine origin of Scripture, in consequence of its scientific inaccuracies, are just as futile as would be the assertion that milk is not food because it is not strong meat. Similarly, mere facts in human history which may be learned by ordinary methods, are outside the pale of necessary Divine intervention. One of the Evangelists expressly tells us that he narrates the life of Jesus on the authority of those who were themselves eye-witnesses and servants of the Word, and with the precaution of observing the most rigorous accuracy in his own reproduction of their accounts. Why are we to attribute to St. Luke a divine safeguarding beyond what he claims himself? If he felt that he was at every moment the object of supernatural guidance, was he not very much to blame for not declaring the fact, and thereby giving his readers the highest possible assurance of his accuracy? When St. Paul repeatedly says, "I speak as a man because of your weakness: I speak self-degradingly;" when he beseeches his converts to bear with him when he boasts, as he seems to think, a little immoderately if not immodestly, in order to assert the more fully his Apostolic office and qualifications, are we to conceive that these and the like expressions were directly dictated to him by that Spirit whose intrinsic utterances must share the entire and absolute perfection of that Godhead of which He is a Person? Is not the human element as necessary to Scripture as it is to the person and character of Christ? And do not those who would exclude any really human element from Scripture repeat in another shape the early heresy which denied a human soul to Christ? And if such human element there be; if the writers of the several books which composed the Canon introduced into their writings their own human personality, as we cannot help acknowledging they did in respect of style and language and predominant tone of thought, each writer having his own peculiarities in all these respects, we must not forget that these writers were themselves imperfect and sinful beings, and that their productions cannot escape the imperfections arising naturally from the imperfections of the authors. This is not my reasoning; it is the reasoning of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the introduction to which appeals to the Early Jewish Christians not to go back from Christ to Moses, seeing that Christ, being the very stamp of the Divine essence (χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ) spake the mind of God with a completeness and perfection which no merely human messenger of God could claim. Those who pretend that all Scripture is on an exact equality, because all Scripture was inspired by God, fly in the face of the argument by which this part of Scripture justifies the supreme rank of Christ amongst the revealers of God's will to man. They forget that the imperfection of the instru-

ment must modify the complex result produced by the action of the Divine Spirit through that instrument. And they do not see that their well-meant efforts to uphold the authority of the Sacred Books will only serve to discredit those books entirely. For, if it be necessary, in order that Scripture be inspired, that Scripture be infallibly accurate in every expression, in every fact, then, inasmuch as the most cursory examination proves that such infallible accuracy it does not possess, its inspiration must be given up: and we are left without any guide at all because we refuse to have any guide except such a guide as it has not pleased God to give us.

In fact, the tone of mind which ascribes infallibility to Scripture is exactly the same as that which attributes infallibility to the Church. Indeed, the infallibility of Scripture would require the Church to be equally infallible, since we could not receive a document claiming infallibility on any authority which was not infallible itself.

The Roman Catholic, therefore, who maintains the infallibility of both Scripture and the Church, occupies a more logical position than does the Protestant who maintains the infallibility of Scripture only. But both are wrong; the "search for infallibility" is vain. Absolute infallibility does not exist for us, either in Scripture or in the Church. Nor would it help us, did it exist in either or in both. For we could not be sure that we were ourselves infallibly guided, even by the infallible guide, unless we were at each moment sure that we infallibly understood that infallible guide. Infallible guidance, to be useful, would require an infallible capacity for being guided.

But, because we discard the notion that Holy Scripture is infallible—a notion to whose very statement it would be necessary, that Scripture should be exactly preserved to us without a single tittle of change or doubt, that of all the thousands of various readings which exist in different manuscripts there should not be one, that the Bible, in short, should exhibit the phenomenon, which Mussulmen ascribe to the Koran, of having but one known text in all its multiplied copies: because we no longer ascribe to Scripture an impossible and useless infallibility—an infallibility which Scripture nowhere claims itself—let us not on that account deny its inspiration. The presence and guidance of the Holy Ghost is only conditioned, not destroyed, by the imperfections and sinfulness of those in whom He may have dwelt. Though we no longer conceive of the Bible as a series of separate texts, each of them invested with the precision and completeness of a mathematical theorem, each one of them capable of being construed independently to its utmost possibility of meaning, we are not warranted in declining to be guided by the sense of larger portions of the Bible, construed with that tact, equity, and sobriety with which every human document must be interpreted, if itsmeaning is not to be forced, and balanced against each other with due sense of their relative weight and position in the long series of the revelations made by God to man. And so of other things. Because we perceive that the gross notions of the Resurrection which used to be commonly held, though they were unknown to the Early Church, and are positively contradicted by the reasonings of St. Paul, are quite untenable on scientific grounds, we are not to evaporate the Resurrection of the body into a metaphor, and to revert to the unbiblical notion of the immortality of the soul. Because we do not hold that the Sacraments ordained by Christ do their work mechanically, whether the mind of the recipient or of those concerned for him accompany the rite or not, we are not to deny that the Sacraments have any operation, as so many of us have been taught to do, on the plea of magnifying Christ, as though Christ were magnified by depreciating His own institutions. Because we cannot find in the New Testament this or that particular form of Church government defined with perfect accuracy, and prescribed as of absolute necessity, we are not authorised to regard all forms of Church government as exactly equivalent, discarding the unmistakeable verdict of history that the episcopal owed its establishment to the matured wisdom of the Apostles. Because we no longer believe that this universe was created in six days, we are not justified in calling the Mosaic cosmogony, intended as it was to teach the fact of creation by one sole God, and perhaps also its main order, a mere philosophic speculation or a myth. Because the Fourth Commandment, which prescribes absolute rest from work on the seventh day, in commemoration of God's supposed rest after creation, so that even the commanded Temple-worship was an infraction of the Sabbath—because this commandment is not the reason nor the measure of our observance of the first day of the week, in commemoration of the Resurrection of our Saviour, we are not thereby justified in setting aside Apostolic precedent and universal Christian practice, and in ceasing to observe that solemn Christian festival. And so, to revert to what I first adduced. Because we cease to believe that God has purposely so arranged things as that the great majority of mankind shall be plunged into a hell of everlasting torture for sins they could not help committing, we are not to relinquish the belief that God will bring every work of man to judgment, and will not allow evil to go unpunished in the next world as it often does in this. These are but a few samples of doctrines and practices which must not be abandoned out of an impatient reaction from mediæval abuses and exaggerations. No doubt there is now on all sides a call for the reconsideration of doctrinal standards. Even in the Calvinistic churches of Scotland, even among the more enlightened Catholics of Germany, this call is heard; nor can we suppose it will not make itself heard amongst ourselves. The authors of our Articles were quite as much under the unconscious influence of the scholastic methods as were the

authors of the Westminster Confession ; they did not understand the true position of the Bible, nor its actual meaning in many of its parts as well as we can do ; for they were not possessed of all the information we possess, and we are guilty if we bury that information in a napkin. The Church at large, as well as individual members of it, ought to be increasing each year in wisdom and mental stature ; without such growth we have no right to expect increasing favour either with God or men. It is therefore in a return to "the faith once for all delivered to the Saints," from the additions and corruptions which gradually stole into the Church through its long course—a return made gradually, "soberly, advisedly, discreetly, and in the fear of God," out of mature conviction and not out of random and temporary or sectarian feeling, that we must expect the revivification of the Church, and its restoration to that influence from which it has of late so lamentably fallen. It is impossible to keep the Church in darkness, while all around is flooded with light ; it is absurd to suppose that the discoveries of recent science are to be simply ignored or set aside in their evident bearings on Scripture, or the truths which are supposed to be taught in Scripture. But while discovery is ever going on, whilst the knowledge of our day far exceeds the knowledge of all previous times, it is still full of comfort to perceive that the grounds of belief and the facts believed, being matters of history, remain untouched. No recent discovery in any way impugns the statements of either the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene. These wonderful documents, the former of which probably goes back to the very time of the Apostles, do not touch on any of the points on which science and religion seem to come into collision. There is no allusion in them to the primal state of man. Whether there has been a fall from original innocence, or a gradual rise from original imperfection, the Creeds do not decide. They say not a word upon the origin of evil ; on the subtleties of predestination and free-will they are silent. They do not define the inspiration of Holy Scripture, they do not even assert its inspiration. They say not a word on the antiquity of our globe, the time occupied by its creation, the duration of human life upon it. If we are but satisfied with them, we should have to fear no contradiction, whether from science or from criticism. And, remark, in this abstinence from theory, in this statement of mere fundamental and historic fact, they faithfully represent the utterances of the Great Teacher. In vain will you search the words of Christ for any of those points of supposed Christian dogma on which modern science has fastened its opposition to Christianity. Facts within the domain of history, such as the Birth, the Death, the Resurrection of the Saviour, the truth of which is abundantly proved by an appeal to history ; facts such as the existence and the creative activity of God, which though fully declared by Scripture only, may be inferred from the most recent disclosures of science, which, I make bold to say, have made Atheism absurd, facts such as the Deity of the Saviour and of the Spirit which are superscientific, and which need fear therefore no scientific contradiction,—*these* are the truths set forth in the two great Creeds universally received in Christendom ; deductions from these facts can never be put on the same level with the facts themselves ; nor may any one be excluded from the pale of "the faith once for all delivered to the Saints" for refusing to accept them.

When therefore, we are bidden to contend earnestly for "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," we ought to recollect that our contention should be two-fold. It must, in the first place, be a contention for the great facts of Christianity, as set forth in the New Testament, and as summarised in the two great Christian Creeds. It must, in the second place, be a contention for the preservation of these great facts from all presumptuous admixture, for their preservation in their simple purity. When we are battling for any of our own metaphysical or dogmatical inferences from the faith, we are not battling for the faith itself, as St. Jude bids us do. Review the infidel controversies of the last centuries down to the present time with care, and you will be surprised to find how much of the dispute turns on things alien from that body of facts on whose supreme importance I am insisting. Persecution, as well as controversy, would have died out had this rule been observed. The Inquisition would have had few martyrs had the Inquisitors confined themselves to that body of doctrine which their own Church in the third Session of the Tridentine Council has expressly declared to be the Rock on which the Church is built, I mean, the Nicene Creed. And so in modern times, numbers of persons fancy they are rejecting Christianity, when in fact they are only questioning certain theories of Christianity. Numbers, too, fancy they are fighting for Christianity when they are really fighting for certain theories of Christianity. These theories may be true or they may be false ; every one should be allowed his own opinion upon that, but to confound them with "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," to suppose that the additions to the Creeds made whether by the Church of Rome in the Creed of Pope Pius, or by the Lutheran Church in the Confession of Augsburg, or by the Church of Geneva in the Helvetic Confession, or by the Church of England in her Articles, or by the Church of Scotland in the Confession of Westminster, which has so strangely superseded the older and simpler Confession of the great Scotch Reformers,—to suppose, I say, that these additaments, whether true or false, are any part of that deposit of the faith for which St. Jude exhorts us to contend, is to be ignorant alike of Scripture and of the history and evolution of doctrine in the Church.

And these considerations remove much of the obloquy which by the history of the Church would

otherwise appear to attach to Christianity. The bad fruits it too frequently exhibits were the fruits not of Christianity, but of accretions and additions to Christianity; they sprang not from the faith itself, but from explanations and glosses which had crept from the margin into the text. If anything can powerfully impress on you the precept of St. Jude, it is the lesson which history reiterates; the lesson inculcated with respect to one portion of the Divine message in such awful language as in the last chapter of the Apocalypse: "If any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the Holy City, and from the things that are written in this book."

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY DECEMBER 18, 1880.

THE SITUATION IN IRELAND.—III.

AS the Government is giving the Land League another month of unrestrained licence before the meeting of Parliament, the League is not slow about making hay while the sun shines. It is extending itself rapidly, by the formation of branches in new districts; and employing its accustomed mode of action, wherever it is organised. "Boycotting," nocturnal visits, cattle maiming, rick burning, and "carding" follow in its wake. There can be little doubt that Mr. Bright's speech has given the agitation an additional impetus; but his proposal regarding the reclamation of waste lands, however valuable it may be, would never satisfy the popular demands. Landlordism as an institution is to be abolished. There is more behind the agitation than is clearly apparent, though to give the Parnellites their due they are generally sufficiently plain spoken, and have little fear of "the pretended humanitarian" before their eyes—for so their leader publicly styled the Irish Secretary! The cry now is very much "We are accounted poor citizens, the patricians good. What authority surfeits on would relieve us: if they would yield us but the superfluity while it were wholesome, we might guess they relieved us humanely . . . Let us revenge this with our pikes." Irishmen delight in public meetings, in the speeches, the music, display and general excitement; but the agitation has now gone so far there can be little doubt that in addition to an almost universal breach of contract between tenant and landlord as regards payment of rent, the natural result of the oft-repeated charge to "hold the harvest," and to pay only Griffith's valuation, there is a further movement in the direction of revolution should opportunity offer. It is a cruel act on the part of those, who must know better, to flatter the foolish vanity of their followers, by dangling such a picture before them. Should such a crisis unhappily occur, it could only have one outcome—an outcome which those who lived in Ireland in 1848 and 1867 can easily forsee—

> "You may as well
> Strike at the heaven with your staves, as lift them
> Against the British State; whose course will on
> The way it takes, cracking ten thousand curbs
> Of more strong link asunder than can ever
> Appear in your impediment."

But if it be culpable on the part of leaders, intoxicated with the constant extitement of public meetings, to lead their followers into such dangerous paths; what shall we say of a Government that looks on at all this in silence, or almost in silence? For the intended prosecution of Mr. Parnell and others has had no effect in stopping the course of public agitation. Meeting after meeting is still held, at which the people are openly told to pay only a portion of their rents; in other words to break legal contracts, at which they are warned under dreadful penalties to take no land from which any one has been evicted, no matter how unworthy of sympathy the evicted tenant may have been, at which they are told all landlords must be abolished, no distinction being made in the insane and sweeping denunciations. When this is permitted week after week, and month after month, to go on unchecked, who can wonder at the present miserable and shameful state of affairs in Ireland? Last year Ireland was the recipient of a world-wide charity; but now she speaks, not as "in hunger for bread but in thirst for revenge." It is often said that there is no word for gratitude in the Irish language, and Mr. Gladstone might have learnt this ere now. His messages of peace have produced but little fruit. His Church act and his Land act have not conciliated nor quieted Ireland, nor will any legislation it is possible for him to carry do so. We must only hope that the limits of concession will be reached as soon as possible, and then let the question be brought to a decided issue, whether Ireland is ever to be the field for chronic discontent and agitation.

BROAD CHURCH OR NO CHURCH.

A Review of Mr. Stopford Brooke's Apology for his Secession.

By the Rev. W. SMITH, late Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Curate of St. Pancras.

Just as men may rise, as individuals, on stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things, so may man, the species, progress to higher and fuller apprehensions of Truth and of Goodness upon the stepping-stones of dead systems and lifeless superstitions. We are grateful, therefore, to those who assist us so to rise by giving the death-blow to old prejudices, and effete and worn-out principles, and who, at the same time, by their bold, fearless, and onward march, clear the path immediately in front of them, which, over the altar stairs of this world, slopes through the darkness to the abode of Light, and Truth, and Good.

So it is that there is something to be thankful for in every earnest religious movement, even when that movement is conducted upon lines not strictly orthodox, and when the conceptions and aims of its promoters are imperfect, incomplete, partial, or distorted. Be sure that, whatever he may be struggling *for*, there is certain to

be (assuming him to be in earnest) some error or errors that he is struggling *against*; and the very intensity of the struggle, the concentration of effort upon the point, or points, against which the whole force of his intellectual energy is directed, is the very thing which leads him astray from the main road of Catholic comprehensiveness, and sound and right conceptions of the Truth as a vast and complete whole.

We shall find ample confirmation of the truth of this assertion, if we study the various religious movements which have taken rise and direction since the founding of Christianity. Take one example. The Protestant Reformation movement in Luther's days acquired, in the intensity of the struggle, a one-sided tendency, which led to partial and imperfect apprehensions of Truth, and to the formulation of erroneous principles, which have coloured the aims and misdirected the energies of a great proportion of the Christian world to this very day. No one, however. would wish to impeach the work done by the Protestant Reformers. They gave the death-blow to innumerable superstitions, which barred the way to the knowledge of the Truth. And, if, standing upon their dead selves, the Reformers and their Protestant successors, elated with their victory, and gazing with satisfaction upon the fallen foe, have wasted much effort in slashing at and mutilating the moribund corpses of the vanquished, upon which they stand, instead of taking from their newly-acquired vantage-ground of observation a more thorough, sweeping, and comprehensive survey of the road which leads to the presence of God; at least let us be thankful that they have made the task easier for those that come after them. We enjoy the benefit of their labours, and we can make use of these stepping-stones.

Approaching our subject from this point of view, we are not disposed to be too severely indignant with Mr. Stopford Brooke for his initiation of a movement which threatens to assume larger and vaster proportions than even he at present seems inclined to expect. What the ultimate result will be we do not venture to predict. We feel sure that a movement, so much in accordance with the spirit of the age in which it is made, will present great attractions to many impatient minds. Thoughtful men are dissatisfied with the present condition of things and long for some methodical and systematic arrangement of the ideas which, up to the present time, have floated loosely and incoherently through the minds of many earnest and real, if not deep, thinkers. These have, up to the present time, been content to remain members of the Church of their fathers. Mr. Brooke tells them this course is open to them no longer.

It is for such as these that the words of this paper are mainly penned. It is our desire to point out in this review that the course proposed to Broad Churchmen by Mr. Brooke is unnecessary, and that the position he has taken up is—with all its advantages, with all its fearless exposure of error, and of cant—partial, misleading, based upon false premisses, and illogical.

There are four main considerations put forward by Mr. Brooke in his public Apology, as having induced him to secede from the Church of England, all of which are fundamental in their nature. We will review them each in turn. They are these—(1) A belief that God is present in every man in the same manner, though not in the same degree, as in Christ. (2) A feeling of the necessity of making vast concessions to Science. (3) A disbelief in what he calls the Imperialistic Conception of God implied and assumed in the Church's system. (4) A conviction that for the Liberal Party in the Church compromise is no longer comprehensible.

1. First, then, what does Mr. Brooke mean by saying that God is present in the same manner in men as in Christ? He commences by assuming that which he desires to prove, and then proves his point from this preliminary assumption. It is arguing in a circle. Thus:—Man can develope into a Christ. Therefore, Christ may have been and probably was developed from a man. Now God revealed Himself in Christ. Therefore He reveals Himself in every man. Therefore God is in man. Therefore every man may develop into a Christ.

The most striking point in the argument is the fact of a Christ,* One feels that He is not wanted. He is out of place,—something altogether foreign to the argument.

But let us examine Mr. Brooke's preliminary assumption that man can develop into a Christ unaided. If he is right, then Humanity is wrong. If he is right, then Humanity has been and is affected with an all-pervading nightmare. It has wanted that which it did not want all along. It has stretched lame hands of faith and groped to what it felt was Lord of all, when all the while such an impatient and unrestrained display of feeling on Humanity's part was most unseemly, not to say vulgar. Humanity ought to have known what was best for it, and should have set about its task of developing itself in a well-bred, orderly, and gentlemanly manner. But perhaps, after all, Mr. Brooke may have "made a mistake in the party." It certainly looks very much like a case of mistaken identity. The Humanity we have been accustomed to has all along felt and known it to be, and said it was impossible for any one of the sons of men to be what they long to be if left to themselves. It has proclaimed with piteous wail, and most unwillingly, and the confession has been only wrung from it when distracted with a sense of its utter self-helplessness. "It is impossible, we feel it, we know it to be so, for any one of our species to be what we feel we might be—impossible if we are left to ourselves. We need the application of a stimulus applied from without. We need the infusion of a fresh and vigorous

* By Christ we understand that Being in whom is supplied that which man lacks.

1. He has to bring all the Divine attributes down from heaven and place them within the reach of humanity. He has to supply God to all men. Therefore in Him must be gathered up *all* the Divine fulness. For Christ has not to supply the needs to meet the requirements and to satisfy the aspirations of one man, but of all humanity. God is, so to speak, the sum-total of all the right aspirations of all men in all times. If Christ fail to bring all these realities within the reach of humanity, even if he fail but in respect to one individual man of all the millions that make up the sum-total of humanity, he is not Christ, for He fails to fulfil all the conditions of a Christ.

2. His nature must also be essentially human, or there will be no possible channel through which these graces may be communicated to man. In everything that constitutes man a man—reason, sentiment, will, body, soul, and spirit—Christ must be man. If He be not this, He is not the hope of humanity.

3. He must be sinless, or he would fail of his purpose. For man seeks to get free from his sins. It is indeed the only reason why he wants a Christ. A Christ-man, with only a single sin, and that sin the very least that we can conceive of, would disappoint him. For though He could give him *almost* assurance; so long as that one spot of sin remained, the assurance would not be complete.

4. Lastly, to satisfy the requirements of man—that is to say, to be really Christ—He must have been Christ at the instant of His birth into the world. He must be Christ for the infant a moment old, as for the Methusaleh. There is no scope for development here.

life—a Christ in whom and through whom we can raise ourselves out of ourselves to perfection and God-likeness." But Mr. Brooke's Humanity says nothing of the kind, or if it does put up its timid hand and humbly ventures to suggest that it does want something of that sort, it gets a sharp rap over the knuckles from Mr. Brooke's ruler, and is peremptorily told to hold its silly tongue, for that he knows what it wants far better than it does itself. His Humanity would say we imagine something of this sort, "We have within us that which can develope into absolute Perfection unaided. It will be a painful effort for us to attain to that state, but one man did it, therefore we all can." This "one man," this hero, Mr. Stopford Brooke's Humanity calls Christ, which is a palpable crib from the other Humanity's book. Now this surely is hardly fair, and Mr. Brooke must pardon it for being a little annoyed at his dressing up his idol, calling it by the same name as the Christ of the other and older Humanity, and trying to pass it off as that which exactly meets its requirements, when all along that other Humanity has distinctly said that it wants something else.

Mr. Stopford Brooke's notion is very pretty and, to a certain extent, clever, but it won't do. And it won't do because the Universal Conscience testifies that it is a sham. Let us have a Christ that satisfies the cravings of a sin-worn, sin-stained Humanity—a Humanity that seeks to be freed from the burden of its sins, and cannot, and knows that it cannot, unaided by the application of a fresh life infused into it through a real Christ, or let us have no Christ at all. It is not enough to say that the objective stimulus is now applied through Mr. Stopford Brooke's hero, for if he attained to Christliness without it, then Humanity can do the same; and if he did not, then a previous Christ was needed to produce this Christ, which is absurd.

(2.) And next as to Mr. Brooke's ideas respecting the concessions to science to be made on the part of religion.

Mr. Brooke, should have spoken rather of concessions to scientific men. Science is infallible. It is not so with scientific men. Theorists in religion are apt to fall into one of two opposite errors. First in running their heads too obstinately against the proved conclusions of science, as in the case of Galileo: and next in too hastily making concessions of principle to scientific men out of regard for so called scientific theories which do not rest at all on proved conclusions. It is a telling satire upon the materialism of the present age; and so evidently Mr. Mallock felt it to be when he penned his clever book "The New Republic," that there are amongst us at the present time men of science, who are not men of science merely, but who seek to combine the office of seer with that of physician: who would be Platos and Bacons at one and the same time. They profess great admiration for M. Comte and Positivism, and are yet inconsistent enough to form certain theories concerning the development of species and other matters, and then, having elaborated their systems on a purely *philosophical*, endeavour to shift them to a *scientific* basis. They first construct theories and then endeavour to make the facts square with them. Now, whatever this may be, it clearly is not Positivism. For our own part we see no reason why we may not apply the principles laid down by M. Comte to ethics as to other sciences.

Without attempting to elaborate an ethical system which shall harmonise with Divine revelation, let us take certain great ethical facts, and see in what respect they run counter to Church Principles.

First there is the fact that all humanity is tainted with sin. We do not use the word theologically. We mean what humanity meant when she herself so dubbed it—*ἁμαρτία, ἀνομία, παραπτώμα, ὀφειλήμα*—call it what you will. Theology does not invent either the thing itself, or its name. Humanity found herself afflicted with the disease, and named it before theology became a science. And further than that, (and this is fact number two,) humanity, left to herself, found herself unable to get free from this disease. We start with these two broad ethical facts. Next trenching upon the province of experimental ethics, we find that humanity, assisted by such means as Christ provided through the church, can attain to comparitive freedom from sin. We do not think that we are trespassing beyond the limits laid down by Positivism, when we assert that, none have ever so approximated to perfection, as the Church's Saints:—and that on the contrary unassisted humanity has fallen, and does fall very low, indeed. We can conceive of no sadder picture than that which is presented in the pages of the report, which the governor of that colony presented to Parliament on the state of the convict settlement at Botany Bay; and which was felt to be of so revolting a character, that it could not with decency and propriety be read aloud in the House of Commons.

Well, here are facts, and facts too of a scientific character, which it falls within the province of religion to take cognisance of. What we would urge is this; that with respect to the relations that must perforce exist between religion and science, for both aim at the amelioration of the species, *there should be established a principle of give and take.* If science expects religion to make concessions to her, then science must be prepared to make concessions to religion. If she asks us to concede to her the reality of certain scientific facts, which she proposes for our acceptance on the ground of her votaries' experience and observation; then let her grant to us the reality of certain ethical facts which we propose equally upon the ground of our experience and observation. It is as unreasonable to expect sympathy for science from a man who has found by experience the intense reality of the coviction of sin, when science seeks to pooh! pooh! his assertions, as it is for a religious man to expect sympathy for his convictions from those, whose teaching and life-labours he professes to disdain, and to treat with contempt.

Now what course has Mr. Stopford Brooke elected to pursue in this respect? He, from having mixed with professedly religious men, has had much experience of the way in which some (many alas!) affect to treat matters which they do not understand, but which his higher mental culture enables him to appreciate thoroughly. He has been properly disgusted at such treatment. His sympathy for the teachers of science has been much quickened by the unceremonious, ungraceful and uncharitable way in which such have been handled by religious quacks. Sympathy has led on to the adoption of their theories; and so doubts have been engendered in his mind, which he has at last allowed to over-master him. One cannot help contrasting his method with that of Tennyson's friend, who

> Fought his doubts, and gathered strength.
> He would not make his judgment blind
> He faced the spectres of the mind
> And laid them: so he came at length
> To find a firmer faith his own.

Mr. Brooke should have waited awhile, and pondered over the other side of the question more carefully. He should have dwelt on those great ethical facts which larger minds than Tyndal's, or Harrison's, or Matthew

Arnold's have found so intensely real. In his patience he should have won his soul, and he would never have had need to deplore a step which cannot eventually conduce to his happiness and his peace of mind.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ATONEMENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Mr. R. Galbraith seems to be at a loss for a reply to the "assertion or difficulty" that "the doctrine of the Atonement is a token of retrogression and not of progression; it makes God's character now require to confer forgiveness that which it formerly required not."

Is not the most satisfactory reply to be found by showing that the directly opposite of this assertion is exhibited in the Bible; that the difficulty in fact is non-existent. The doctrine of the Atonement, or the deliverance of man by the vicarious suffering and death of the Deliverer, runs through the whole of the Scriptures from the beginning to the end. It is presented in a great variety of forms,—in promises, in prophecies, in types, in descriptions of the attributes of God. And beginning, after the manner of the Bible in some other things, with intimations more or less obscure, it is revealed with increasing clearness, until it is presented as on accomplished fact in the New Testament.

All this cannot be invalidated by our finding a number of passages in which the divine forgiveness of sin is spoken of without such Atonement being alluded to. It surely is not absolutely necessary that, whenever a truth is asserted, everything else connected with it should invariably be mentioned.

Allow me, as briefly as possibly, to refer to some of the Scripture proofs to which I have above alluded.

1. In Gen. iii. 15,—in that very briefly recorded primæval promise to sinful man,—it is intimated that the Deliverer would himself suffer in accomplishing his work.

2. The practice of animal sacrifices, as an essential part of acceptable worship, appears as a fact in the case of Abel; and is very reasonably regarded as ordered from the first, (see Gen. iii. 21.) Such sacrifices were most appropriate and intelligible, when viewed as representations of the worshipper's sin being laid with the penalty of death upon another, in order that he himself might be forgiven; but on any other supposition their early existence and prevalence are perfectly inexplicable.

3. The account of the sacrifice of Isaac in Gen. xxii. is wound up with the promise then *first* given to Abraham, that in his *seed* should all nations of the earth be blessed; thus intimating that the strikingly-typical transaction, in which he had been just engaged, was made the occasion of a clearer revelation of the death of the coming Saviour, and that he then "saw the day of Christ and was glad."

4. The wonderful proclamation of "the name of the Lord" in Exod xxxiv. 7, affords an irrefragable proof that the doctrine of the Atonement is no afterthought or retrogression, but is interwoven, in the Scriptures, with the sublimest attributes of God. The words, as they stand,—"forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty," are a contradiction, which cannot be explained away, and which no ingenuity of man can fairly reconcile, until the reconciliation is seen in all its completeness in the atoning death of the Saviour, who was reckoned as "the guilty" one and as such was "by no means cleared."

Strange to say this very passage is referred to by Mr. Galbraith's objecter, as his first example of the divine forgiveness requiring no sacrifice or atonement; but it can be so used only after a process of mutilation, such as could make the Bible mean anything or nothing according to each man's will.

5. From Moses we come to the Ceremonial Law of the Jews, which with all its complicated machinery, and stern penalties, was built up altogether upon the assumption that sinful man could not approach the Holy God for forgiveness and acceptance, without a mediating priest, and a substituted sacrifice. This is so obvious, that I will only select as an example the ceremonies of the "Day of Atonement," wherein a vicarious death for sin, and the removal of its guilt from the transgressor by its being laid upon the head of an innocent victim, were exhibited as strikingly as it is possible for a typical act to do.

6. Lastly, we have the prophetic Scriptures bringing out this doctrine with still greater clearness, as the fulness of the time drew nearer; and in them it will be sufficient to notice Isaiah liii, which so graphically describes the vicarious death of Christ, as that of one on whom the sins of man were laid.

It is unnecessary to refer to the New Testament, in which this doctrine appears as one of the most fundamental truths of the Christian religion, as that religion is presented in the Bible.

Now, Sir, men may reject this doctrine; they may reject the Bible as an authority; and they must stand or fall to their own master; it is not our place to judge them. But it is our place to judge, when professing to take the Scriptures as their guide men ignore, misstate, or contradict plain matters of fact, which, whether they approve of them or not, are there before our eyes.

Teignmouth. G. A. JACOB, D.D.

SIR,—No one would be more grateful than myself if Mr. Sandlands would point out which of my propositions are "untrue." If Mr. Sandlands cannot do this, perhaps some other of your readers will do so, not only in the interests of Truth, but to correct an unwitting offender. CHARLES VOYSEY.

BAPTISM.

SIR,—It may interest some of your readers to see the followiug statement written to me by my scholarly neighbour, the Rev. James H. Walsh, D.D., of St. Stephen's in this City, with reference to the signification of that clause in the Baptismal service, about which some letters have recently appeared in the columns of "THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT:"—"There can be no doubt, I think, that the meaning of 1 Peter iii. 20 is that Noah and his family were saved by *means* of water, that the *water* which bore up the Ark was the *medium* by which those in it were saved. Moreover, the language of St. Peter might fairly be appealed to, as determining the meaning of the clause in our Baptisimal office. 'Who didst save Noah and his family in the Ark, from perishing from water,' if the prayer in which the clause occurs were an *original* composition of the Prayer Book. Such, however, we know was not the case. The compilers borrowed the prayer

from 'The Consultation' of Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne, drawn up by Melanchthon and Bucer, in 1543. In it, it is the *destructive*, and not the *saving* agency of the water of the Flood that is dwelt on: '*Qui olim impium mundum horribili judico tuo, per diluvium perdidisti, et solam familiam pii Noe . . . conservasti,*' words which were paraphrased in Edward's first Book ('which if Thy justice didst destroy by floods of water the whole world for sin, except eight persons, whom of Thy mercy, the same time, Thou didst save in the Ark,') and condensed in Edward's second Book in the form which is still retained, 'who didst save Noah and his family in the Ark from perishing by water' ('*ne in aquis perirent*') Bright and Medd." Dr. Walsh handed me the above statement only this afternoon, and I lose no time in forwarded it to you for publication.

CHARLES EDWARD TISDALL, D.D.,
Chancellor of Christ Church.

Dublin, December 7th, 1880.

—:o:—

BANNS.

SIR,—Some clergymen ask the Banns during the office of Holy Communion at early celebration, and not after the Second Lesson during the time of Morning Service. If "cause or just impediment exist" and remain undeclared because of insufficient publication, what position do these clergymen hold in the eye of the law? And is the legal status of those married in any way affected by the absence of sufficient publication of the Banns? T. C. S.

—:o:—

ENDOWED SERMONS.

SIR,—I read with much interest the paragraph in your number for Nov. 20th, giving an account of the sermon at St. Mary-le-Bow, commemorative of Queen Elizabeth's accession. It has long been my opinion that a most curious and attractive repertory might be formed by a list of endowed sermons, which the parishes of the country could furnish. Could you not invite information? Perhaps some of your readers might suggest means of collecting such particulars from whole Dioceses. My wonder is that such a collection has not been made long ago.

Upton St. Leonards. JOHN EMERIS.

The Rev. Robert Wheler Bush, rector of St. Michael's, Wood-street, has been collated by the Bishop of London to the rectory of St. Alphage, London-wall, vacant by the death of the Rev. R. Wood. Mr. Bush, who was ordained in 1844, was for thirty-three years head master of the Islington Proprietary School, to which he was appointed in 1846.—His lordship has also collated the Rev. C. J. Goody, for nineteen years curate of St. Marylebone, to the vicarage of Whetstone.

On Tuesday night a meeting was held at Northampton in aid of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and the attendance is stated by the local *Herald* to have been unprecedented. The chair was taken by Mr. Spencer, M.P., and addresses were delivered, amongst others, by Sir Richard Temple and Earl Nelson.

Canon Vaughan last week returned to the tithepayers of the parish of Harpenden the whole of the excess on the averages beyond the amount at which the tithes were commuted under the act of 1836.

THE MEMORIAL TO THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

(*Continued from page 588.*)

The Rev. C. W. Markham: "I desire to explain that the movement took its origin from a letter in the *Guardian* from the Rev. F. W. Peel suggesting that those who had signed the address of thanks to the Bishop of Lincoln should shew their approval of his noble defence of the Church's rights in a substantial and practical way—by contributions to the Foundation of the See of Southwell. On seeing that letter I, as Secretary within the county of Lincoln for the Southwell Bishopric Endowment Fund, offered, with the approval of the Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham, to receive subscriptions, and have received about £300. I much regret that a larger sum has not come in, and that so very few comparatively of those who signed the address have contributed to the fund. Some objected to contribute in any way to increasing Church endowments in these days; others refused to contribute to any extension of the Episcopate so long as Bishops are appointed as at present. I am of opinion that a system which has given us a Henry Philpotts, a Samuel Wilberforce, a Charles Langley, a George Selwyn, a Christopher Wordsworth, cannot be altogether a bad system, and I for one am not averse to its extension. With these few remarks I beg to move the following resolution: 'That, as a fitting supplement to the address of thanks lately presented to the Bishop of Lincoln, an offering should be presenetd to him towards the endowment of the See of Southwell, with an earnest prayer that the subdivision of his immense diocese, which we know he has so much at heart, may speedily be accomplished."

J. Borough, Esq., in seconding the resolution, expressed the satisfaction he, in common with many other admirers of the Bishop of Lincoln, felt at the form the testimonial had taken. "For," he added, "whilst we are paying a well-deserved compliment to a learned and self-denying Bishop, we are helping forward a work of vital importance to the Church itself. The speedy establishment of the Southwell Bishopric will give a mighty impetus to the spiritual work of the Church in the large Dioceses of Lichfield and Lincoln. The only objection I have heard raised to the subdivision of Dioceses is the alleged faulty method by which Bishops are at present appointed; but I doubt much whether it can be improved when I remember that it is the same method as that by which Judges are appointed, and that it has given us such Bishops as Philpotts, Sumner, Wilberforce, Selwyn, Wordsworth, Magee, and others. There are great facilities for the establishment of a See at Southwell which do not exist in the case of the other authorised New Bishoprics. First, there is a splendid Cathedral ready to hand; secondly, a Chapter of Canons, Minor Canons, Lay Clerks and Choristers, already constituted and endowed; thirdly, there is a House and grounds, which, at a small outlay, can be made into a suitable residence for the Bishop. These are no mean acquisitions and helps, so that directly the Endowment Fund is raised for the Bishop's income, he will be appointed, and the Diocese will be fully equipped. In the fervent hope that the £35,000 still required may be speedily collected, I cordially second the resolution."

Dr. Septimus Gibbon (London): "I fully agree with the last speaker that at Southwell there are facilities for the establishment of a Bishopric which do not exist at any of the other sites for the new Sees that have been authorised by Parliament, and I believe that

this Bishopric is more required than any of the others. These facts should stimulate us to increased exertions for the speedy completion of this work—a work which will conduce alike to the political and the religious gain of the Church. The 'Wordsworth Memorial Fund' ought to be the means of making a large addition to the Endowment, as it has a very worthy personal element in it; and I would advise the Committee to make it widely known, and keep it open at least for six months longer, as there are in all parts of the world admirers of Dr. Wordsworth as a Scholar and Churchman, who would be glad to contribute to so well-timed a nd useful a Fund."

The Chairman said: "Before putting the resolution, I have some good news to communicate to the meeting. With regard to the See Town of the new Bishopric, both Nottingham and Derby had strong claims to be constituted the centre of the diocese. Against these rival local claims had to be counterbalanced the great advantages Southwell possesses in its collegiate church, etc., and the additional interest attaching to it from Cardinal Wolsey's residence there; and the remains of his Episcopal Palace still exist to show that in olden days it was found a convenient situation for the head-quarters of a high dignitary of the Church, and for the development of his plans for the extension of the Church. So that the fact that its history is connected with Church work in the 16th century may prevent any feeling of jealousy on the part of other more populous places, whose claims otherwise would demand the first consideration. I, in fact, did suggest that the new Bishopric should take the name of the two County Towns jointly, and he denominated the Bishopric of "Nottingham and Derby," but it was not deemed expedient to alter the title given to the New See in the Act whereby it was rendered practicable to divide the See of Lincoln and Lichfield. I seldom come to Town empty-handed, and to-day I have brought up with me £600 towards the New Bishopric, exclusive of the amount of the Wordsworth Fund. But what is more than this, I have secured the Old Palace Buildings, with the fee simple of its extensive grounds for the future Episcopal Residence which will be given to the New See in perpetuity, free of cost. This Old Palace, in which Cardinal Wolsey once resided, is a fine old building, containing a spacious Hall, a very desirable adjunct to a Bishop's Residence. One speaker has suggested that the transfer of this site, and of these Buildings to the New See, is equivalent to a considerable addition to the Endowment Fund, lessening by so much the amount that has still to be raised. But I would point out that, although the Ecclesiastical Commissioners would doubtless be enabled, in conformity with the Act, to reckon the value of this gift as a contribution towards the minimum Endowment required by the Act, yet that such a construction of the Act would tend to lessen and, to some extent, cripple the usefulness of the future Bishop, as in every New See great demands are of necessity made upon the means of the first occupant of the See; and in the case of Southwell Diocese these demands, *e.g.*, the claims of the religious inspection of Schools and the appointment of Diocesan Inspectors. etc., are certainly not likely to be lighter than they have proved in other recently-formed dioceses. The Bishop of Lincoln would hail the subdivision of his diocese with the liveliest joy and gratitude. As his Lordship stated at a Meeting held at Lincoln last autumn, "he was a martyr to Episcopal work, and it would be greatly to the interest of both the Dioceses of Lincoln and Lichfield if they were relieved by a See formed in connexion with the ancient Minster of Southwell, one of the noblest churches in Christendom."*

The resolution was carried *nem. con.*

On the motion of the Rev. O. E. Slocock (Newbury), seconded by the Rev. W. W. Goddard (Hoxton), a vote of thanks to the Chairman for presiding, &c., was carried by acclamation.

Reviews and Notices.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Walter R. Browne, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; with a preface by the Rev. J. P. Norris, D.D., Canon of Bristol. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880. Pp. xv—158.

This is a well-written and sensible little book, not indeed exhaustive of the subject of which it treats, nor even going very deeply into it, but marked by candour, moderation, and an honest endeavour to allow facts to speak for themselves. The limitation of the discussion to the New Testament, which is announced in the title, is not strictly observed; and, as the writer says, "The inspiration of the New Testament carries with it that of the Old Testament. For the inspiration of the Old Testament is again and again affirmed in the New Testament."

The line adopted is to take two limiting theories, one on each extreme, and to show that, as neither can be reconciled with the facts of the case, the true view must be found somewhere between them; where it lies is then attempted to be ascertained by the application of a probable principle with which the facts appear to fit in and agree.

The two limiting theories are named the Natural and the Literal. Both are supposed to rest on the fact, which is taken for granted, that God has made a revelation of Himself to mankind, and has caused the record of it to be transmitted to us in the Bible. Starting from this premiss, the Natural theory is that the record was written in good faith by intelligent and trustworthy men, but in the exercise of their own ordinary powers, and without any special divine assistance beyond the grace and direction which good men habitually receive from God; while according to the Literal theory, the writers were not only supernaturally assisted, but were so absolutely controlled by the divine Spirit as to become His mere amanuenses, writing word for word what He was pleased to dictate to them. To test these theories the Bible is searched for its own statements and illustrations of the degree in which its writers were influenced from above in the execution of their tasks; and when it is shown, on the one hand, that they certainly claim to be more than ordinary historians or teachers, and to write with a direct supernatural commission and authority; and on the other, that they sometimes avowedly rely on their own judgment, hesitatingly express their own opinions, and differ in minute particulars from each other; the conclusion is drawn that they enjoyed a real, supernatural inspiration, yet not of such an extreme kind as to amount to absolute dictation, or rigidly to exclude everything except what was directly revealed and infallibly true.

Having thus established the position that the truth about inspiration must lie somewhere between the two extremes, the author winds up his enquiry by an attempt "to discover whereabouts within these two limits the

* Of which King James said, "It is an unco' guid Kirk, and guid enough to jostle wi' any Kirk in Christendom."

true place of inspiration is to be found." This he acknowledges to be the most difficult part of the subject, and after expressing his dissatisfaction with the view that inspiration extends only to things spiritual, and not to things temporal, he falls back for his purposes on the "Principle of divine economy." "It is to be expected that God will give all such aid as is *necessary* for the accomplishment of any of His purposes, but it is not to be expected that He will give more." In the case of the Bible, the object is to give an authentic record of His revelation of Himself to mankind, and of that revelation the subject-matter may be classed under the heads of deeds, words, laws, and arrangements, all of a supernatural character. These must be faithfully and distinctly recorded, or the Bible would fail to effect the divine purpose. But in order to give a faithful and distinct record, it is not necessary that all their incidental circumstances and trivial details should be given with the absolute accuracy of a direct message from heaven. So long as the essential substance is presented, the practical purpose is attained. In some cases *direct* inspiration would be necessary, in others *indirect* would be sufficient, and in many parts nothing more than *preventive* inspiration would be required, and in this case "the only work of inspiration will be to prevent the introduction of any serious error, such as could not be detected by the readers of later generations, and might produce evil results."

Such is Mr. Browne's method of vindicating a real supernatural inspiration for the sacred writers, and yet leaving room for those minute discrepancies, inaccuracies of quotation and statement, expressions of individual opinion, and the like, which he allows may be found even in the New Testament. It will be seen that the argument rests upon one class of facts only, viz., the claims to inspiration made by the Biblical writers themselves. At the outset he justifies this limitation, but we doubt whether his readers will generally yield their assent to the plea, which is urged in the following sentence:—"If we believe that the Bible is in any sense the channel of revelation, we must logically be willing to accept with confidence whatever statements we find in it as to the inspiration of its writers, and to take these as our guide in determining its nature and extent." It will also be noticed that the discussion does not deal with those earlier utterances and messages which are represented as coming direct from God, and which yet present serious moral and theological difficulties, and appear to be at variance with, and superseded by, later and more advanced revelations. Any complete discussion of the great subject of inspiration must, we imagine, extend much beyond the limits within which Mr. Browne has confined his investigation.

—:o:—

We understand that *The Antiquary* will in future be conducted by two Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries.

The Leicester Church Extension Society, which finds great difficulty in coping with the very rapidly increasing population of the town, has determined to utilise the large wooden building which was used for the recent Church Congress. The owners of the Clarendon Park estate have also given a site for a new church.

It is reported that the Bishop of St. David's has been obliged to decline receiving literates as candidates for ordination, owing to the number of applications he has received from Nonconformists ministers and candidates leaving Nonconformist colleges. The Bishop of Lincoln has been obliged to make a similar rule, it is said, and for the same reason.

What is the use of cathedrals? is sometimes asked. Let one day's work at Peterborough be offered as a contribution towards a reply. On Sunday last there was an early celebration of the Holy Communion, at which there were upwards of eighty communicants. At eleven o'clock was full choral morning service and Litany, the regular cathedral choir being augmented by the members of the voluntary choir, so that the surpliced body, including clergy and non-choral members of the cathedral, numbered upwards of one hundred and thirty. This service was held in the nave, and an enormous congregation assembled to hear the Bishop preach for the Agricultural Benevolent Fund. The Mayor and Corporation were present, as well as the Mayors of two other neighbouring towns, with some members of their councils. The collection amounted to £91. In the afternoon was full choral Evensong, some of Sphor's "Last Judgement" being sung for an anthem, in the present of a large congregation. And in the evening a special Advent service was held in the nave—probably two thousand, at least, being present—when a sermon was preached by the Rev. T. J. Rowsell, and a second collection made for the funds of the society whose claims were advocated in the morning.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Chapman, Rev. William Edward, vicar of Faringdon, Berks.
Harrison, Rev. Alban Henry, chaplain of Maidstone Goal; vicar of St. Andrew's, Deal.
Hirsch, Rev. H., mission curate of St. Saviour's, Woolwich; rector of St. Michael's, Wood-street, Cheapside.
Jennings, Rev. H. E., curate-in-charge of East Shefford, Berks; organising secretary to the Pretoria Diocesan Fund.
Jephson, Rev. Arthur William,; vicar of St. John's, Waterloo-road.
Myles, Rev. James Perceval, vicar of St. Matthias-on-the-Weir, Bristol; surrogate of the Consistory Court of Bristol.
Nicholas, Rev. W. Ll., curate of Rhyl; rector of Flint.
Scriven, Rev. Thomas Fowell Buxton, vicar of Luttons Ambo.
Smith, Rev. Walter Landon, rector of Bisley, Surrey.
Trendell, Rev. W. H., vicar of Worlabye, North Lincolnshire; honorary organising secretary for the county of Lincoln for the Missions to Seamen Society.
Willacy, Rev. Thomas Robert, perpetual curate of Thorganby.

—:o:—

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bower, Rev. Robert Smith, B.A., rector of St. Mary Magdalen and St. Gregory by St. Paul, at his residence, 19, Park-village west, on the 11th inst.
Dyke, Rev. William, B.D., late fellow and tutor of Jesus College, Oxford, and for twenty years rector of Bagendon, at Bagendon Rectory, Cirencester, on the 9th inst.
Fagan, Rev. Henry M., B.A., Worcester College, Oxford, and formerly of Pakenham, Suffolk, at Brighton, on the 10th inst., aged 27.
Hall, Rev. Henry Francis Udny, rector of Kingsworthy, Hants, at Merville Cannes, France, on the 29th ult., aged 59.
Keene, Rev. Chas. Edmd. Ruck, at Swyncombe, Henley-on-Thames, on the 12th inst., aged 88.
Montgomery, Rev. Robert, M.A., fifty-five years rector of the parish, at Holcot Rectory, Northamptonshire, on the 12th inst., aged 80.
Salusbury, Rev. Thelwall, at Offley Vicarage, Herts, on the 9th inst., aged 79.
Sanders, Rev. James, M.A., for twenty-six years incumbent of Rippondon, Yorkshire, at St. Saviour's Vicarage, Brixton-rise, on the 8th inst., aged 81.
Temple, Rev. Isaac, forty-eight years rector of Plemstall, at his residence, Mayfield House, near Chester, on the 5th inst. aged 87.
Tinling, Rev. George Douglas, late vicar of St. Clement's, Bournemouth, elder son of the Rev. E. Douglas Tinling, canon of Gloucester, at Pau, on the 13th inst., aged 36.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE DAY OF SMALL THINGS.

By the Rev. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A.,
Sub-Warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer.
Author of "The Person and Work of the Holy Ghost," &c., &c.

Sermon Preached at Clewer, on the Sunday next before Advent, 1880.

"For who hath despised the day of small things."—Zech. iv. 10.

AT this season of the Church's year our attention is specially directed to the writings of the Minor Prophets. From which part of the Holy Scriptures the lessons for the last five Sundays after Trinity (when there is the largest number of these Sundays) are all, with one exception, taken. And the reason for this is not far to seek.

The Minor Prophets are not called *Minor* from being inferior in point of matter or style, but simply from the brevity of their prophecies. And in the last three the torch of prophecy burns more clearly and steadily as we draw nearer to the time of the Incarnation. The purpose of these prophecies is summed up in one sentence by the writer of the Book of Ecclesiasticus. "Of the Twelve Prophets," he says, (for so they were called in old time, gathered up into one book) "Let the memorial of the Twelve Prophets be blessed, . . . for they comforted Jacob, and delivered them by assured hope." Eccles. xlix. 10.

How much of Divine Revelation is taken up with this act of comforting the Creature?

The very idea of comfort is associated with the Divine Persons themselves in their relation to this fallen world. The Father is "the God of *all comfort*," the Son describes Himself as a "Comforter," when predicting the coming of the Third Person of the Godhead as "*Another* Comforter;" and the whole purpose of the Scriptures is, St. Paul says, that "through patience and comfort by means of them we might have hope." This is especially the case with those last lights that arose to gladden Israel, and the manifest purpose of the prophet of Zechariah in particular, was to comfort, and encourage God's people.

Let me briefly call your attention to the connection in which our text occurs. It was at a very critical time when these words were uttered. The Jews had returned from bondage, they were laying the foundation of the Second Temple, and whilst they were laying it, in the very moment of their joy and gladness, there were certain among them, Priests and Levites, old men who remembered the old Temple; who when they recalled its beauty, grandeur, and magnificence, were so overcome by the thought, that in the very midst of the rejoicing they wept aloud, so that as we are told by Ezra, "the shout of joy" could not be discerned "from the noise of weeping." (Ezra iii. 13.) Then just at this moment the Revelation of God came through Zechariah, lest they should fall back from their undertaking, leave the work they had commenced, cease to build through the depressing memory of the richness of the former Temple; *then* was it that the voice of the prophet was heard inspiring them with hope and encouragement. "Who hath despised the day of small things?" Let us then, seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit, see what we can learn from this utterance. It teaches us three things:—

I. Something about God.
II. Something about small things.
III. Something about ourselves.

I. First something about God. These words show us that Humility is, if I may say so, a portion of the *Divine Character*. This is the first thought we learn about God. God does not despise "the day of small things." Divines have debated on the point whether we may eumerate lowliness amongst the Divine Perfections, and they have told us that it is impossible to find lowliness in the divine nature in its essence, because there is nothing upon which ot base it. Lowliness rests on our nothingness, our actual sins, dependency, sinfulness. The Life of God is a necessary life. He is self-dependent—the source of all purity, holiness, and greatness, He cannot give His Glory to another, so that there can be no basis in Him for this virtue. Yet there is room for it in the Divine *actions*, though not in the Divine *Essence*.

The first of its traits in Divine actions is the absence, if we may so speak of ostentation in all God's works of nature and of grace; and another is the *condescension* of Divine Providence. Some who have not altogether given up faith in Divine Providence still tell us we must only look for it in *great* things, in vast principles of life involving the destinies of nations, in grand events, but that we must not look for it in little things. It would seem that this very text is an answer to such a view of Divine Providence. God does not "despise the day of small things." It tells us that He, whose Providence is manifested in ruling the spheres of Heaven, does not despise the meanest of His creatures but equally shews His Power in the delicacy of the organisation, in all the marvellous beauty and manifold perfections of the tiniest forms of life. He combines the great with the small; and so when the children of Israel were weeping round the foundation of their structure, filled with remorse at its meanness and littleness, He sends this word of comfort by His prophet, "Who hath despised the day of small things?"

Let me notice in passing what comfort we may derive from the thought that each one of us, however insignificant he may be, yet each act he performs has an interest for God; each communion we

prepare for, every decision of the conscience, every interior movement of the soul, the first thrill of a deep repentance, the first taste of the heavenly gift, the first tears of contrition, all affect Him.

Not only in its prime, in its perfection, in its maturity, in its grand completeness does God take delight the soul, but in the nascent form of undeveloped life, the very foundation of the spiritual structure. He does not "despise the day of small things."

So the text teaches us in this sense, the lowliness of God. We may even go a step further in dealing with the text in regard to God, "Who hath despised the day of small things;" because the day of small things is the day of His Power. He does not despise the first beginnings. He does not despise David when he is called from the sheepfolds, the Apostles when they are drawn from their secular employments. He does not despise us when we are small in our own estimation, for when we are little in our own eyes it is then that He raises us. "It is a singular fact," a Saint has said, "that when a Divine Gift is coming to me, it is ever preceded by a great sense of my own nothingness. When I am filled with infirmity, 'when I am weak, then am I strong.' As the instrument of the Almighty Hand working through me, till all of self is taken out of me, and I become a ready and apt instrument in the hands of my God." So we may even go so far as to say it is in the day of small things that God especially acts; for when we are filled with ourselves, in the day of our great things, when we say, "Thou Lord didst make my hill so strong, I shall never be moved;" then He hides His face from us, and we are troubled.

II. Again, let us look at the text in regard to the small things themselves. "Who shall despise the day of small things?" We learn from this how opposite the thoughts of God are to the thoughts of man. There is nothing more common than for us to despise small things, but "God's thoughts are not as our thoughts, God's ways not as our ways." We despise little things, they are beneath us, we think that for any thing to be done there must be some shining employment, something great according to man's estimate of greatness, and then we attribute these great things to ourselves. You will remember the story of the preacher, who exercised such a great power over a vast congregation by his eloquence, and who was once tempted to think as he saw the effects which his discourse was producing, that this result was owing to his own talents. Now God revealed to him that it was owing to the prayers of a poor lay brother, who was interceding in a corner of the church, for the preacher and the congregation. Our thoughts and measurements are so very different from God's thoughts and measurements. And this first results from pride, which makes us think so many things beneath us, not worthy of care and of finish. It arises also from a certain ignorance as to the value of little things. Now the text says little things *are* important, "Who hath despised the day of small things?" that they are the objects of Divine interest, and Divine estimation.

Let us see why this is. Let us look at the little things themselves and see why the perfection of our ordinary actions is so important. 1. They are important, because *our life is made up of little things*, we have most of us few of what are called great things, great incidents in our lives, grand occasions, but our whole life is a concatenation, a chain of little things; little duties, little temptations, little words of kindness, little acts of charity, little efforts in bearing something in others, in doing our every-day duties of life. So that their very frequency and multitude make little things important. In these things we so often fail. The Psalmist says, "My sins are more in number than the hairs of my head," referring to the number of his "little sins." 2. Again they are important in their *effect upon our spiritual life*, because they require so much effort. Why, you may say, great things must surely require more effort than little things! But are we not helped in manifold ways in doing great things? There is an enthusiasm which carries us over great difficulties—a certain excitement of nature, or the thing itself may perhaps be surrounded by external help, by some display, but in these little things we have to do, we are sustained by nothing of that kind, they are observed by no one around us, are helped on by no emotion, but are simply and purely interior, done before God! Very often they are passive, and every one knows that passive virtues are much more difficult to form than active. To go forth and suffer is easier than to have suffering borne in upon us, whilst we ourselves are still; the simple endurance of passive trials exercises the virtues of the Christian life, sometimes more than great active duties. So these little things have a peculiar greatness about them after all; they are important for they go to make up my life. They are often interior, quite passive, the bearing with the jarring of an opposite character, with passing inconvenience, the discomfort of weather, that wearisome endurance of outward circumstances, the *ennui* of life! We must be very careful in all this to follow the Divine example, and not to despise the day of small things.

III. Lastly, what does the text teach us in general in regard to ourselves?

1. First, it teaches us Hope. God does not despise the day of small things, because He sees in His eternal mind the results. He does not simply see, as we do, the seed. He sees the tree, the flower, the fruit. He sees the end as well as the beginning. When a soul is turning to God, He does not only see it in that moment, but He sees the future of that soul, sees it in its glory, the finished structure, radiant in its accomplished magnificence in the heavenly Jerusalem, and therefore He does not despise "the day of small things." So when we feel depressed almost in despair, because our spiritual life seems so little—so far, seemingly, beneath God's notice—we must imitate God. In

the beginning of our early attempts at a life of repentance and devotion we must regard it with God, "This is only a beginning, only the foundation—what may I become?" I may weep at the remembrance of earlier life, at the remembrance of the first temple of Baptismal grace, but I must not go back to that. I must compare it with that intermediate season of captivity, and then the wail of weeping will be changed into the shout of thanksgiving. First, then, this text gives us Hope; and, secondly, we should learn Patience from it.

There was something, if I mistake not, of a movement of impatience, if not of unthankfulness, in the weeping of those elders. Though it might have been very natural, yet there seems to have been something of defect about it, and the words of the text have almost a sound of rebuke. We must be patient in the re-building of this new life. We may have relapses, manifold interruptions from enemies, infuriated at our efforts; but we must be patient, as God is patient, and God is patient, because He is eternal; and we must be patient, because we are not building for time but for eternity. A story is told of a great artist who was painting a picture, with his pupil working beside him. The latter exclaimed with astonishment when he found he had finished his painting, while his master had apparently but just begun, "Oh, I have finished;" but the painter, with more truth than lowliness, checked his pupil, "*You* paint for time, sir; *I* paint for eternity."

In the spiritual life. What we are doing now is not a work for time, but for eternity. It is not toiling, as we see the toilers in our great cities do; it is not labour for a passing name, a fortune, a passing life of comfort, or luxury; but we labour, we "paint," we build, for eternity, and so we must not expect to build too rapidly.

And as the text gives us lessons of *Hope* and *Patience*, so, lastly, it must fill us with *Emulation*. "Who hath despised the day of small things," not who hath *triumphed* in! Sometimes there is a danger of thinking that we have finished when we have only begun. "The sacrifice of a broken and contrite heart Thou hast not despised," the Psalmist says. Only *not despised*. Contrition, repentance, is only the foundation, not the completion. We must not be content, as though we had finished; but we must be filled with desires for advancement, must covet earnestly the best gifts, must long to progress, till we become a perfect building fitly framed together, "an holy temple in the Lord."

Let us learn, then, these lessons. First, God is so lowly that He takes an interest even in me, in every action of my life. I may sometimes be tempted to like interest too much, the interest of my fellow-creatures. Let me, then, turn round this movement of my nature towards God, and delight in the thought that God is taking an interest in my life, in everything which conduces to my eternal bliss. In attaining to bliss I can alone fulfil the purpose for which He made me. Learn, then, *never to despise anything*. "Nothing is worth doing, unless it is worth doing well." Let us try to do the little things well, to resist the little temptations, to bear the little trials, to fulfil little duties, and remember that in so doing we are glorifying God.

And, lastly, seek to build up the new life with *Hope*, and *Patience*, and *Perseverance*, and we shall find, if we are careful in little things, we shall succeed with the great ones. The old adage will prove true—"Take care of the pence, and the pounds will take care of themselves." Be careful over all the little things that accumulate the wealth of our spiritual life; they will prove the pathway to real greatness, for "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much." (St. Luke xvi. 10.)

JOB'S PIOUS RESIGNATION.

By the Rev. H. HARRIS DAVIES, M.A., Ph. D.,
Vicar of Llangoed and Llanistyn, Anglesea.

Sermon Preached at Llangoed.

"The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord."—Job i. 21.

MANY good and learned men hold very different opinions concerning the Book of Job. Some think that the whole of this book is one continued allegory, or a figurative representation, and not an historical fact. And learned men also differ much, as to the author of this book. Some attribute it to Elihu, some to Moses, some to Solomon, some to Ezra, and others again attribute it to some good and pious man, called Job, whose name it bears, and they tell us, that king David came by it during one of his incursions and conquests in Idumea. Whoever was the author of it, of this we are certain, namely, that it was written in poetry, and the whole book is considered a poem of the highest order, dealing in subjects the most grand and sublime, and its precepts are enforced by the most strong and conclusive arguments, and these arguments are again illustrated by examples the most natural and striking.

This book is considered one of the oldest, the grandest and the most comprehensive of poems that can be found within the whole Bible, and it breathes throughout of the most ardent and unaffected piety. I am inclined to believe, and I openly avow my belief, that Job was a real person, and that his history is a real statement of facts. Job was a man, like thousands of God's children in after years that had experienced a great number of sad losses, and sore disappointments, and if it be true that "whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth," then it is evident, that Job was indeed one of God's dearest children. And in the verses preceeding the text we have an account of the overwhelming deluge that swept away all the riches that he possessed, together with all his children! We read in the third verse, that Job "was the greatest of all the men of the east," but although so rich and happy,

we read also that he was, with one fell stroke reduced to nothing, for he lost all he possessed in goods, chattels and children, not a single son, nor a daughter was spared him, they all perished together in one day! But yet instead of lifting up his hand in sullen disobedience, and breaking forth into a furious passion "as a wild bull in a net," when he was thus smarting under the chastening rod of his Heavenly Father, we see him falling down upon the ground, and with the deepest submission and the greatest reverence, he worshipped God! And in the text we hear him giving utterance to those fervent and pious feelings in which his whole soul seems to have been absorbed at the time, "the Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord."

Now, let us consider:

I. The fact here acknowledged by Job, that is, that "the Lord gave."

In the words immediately preceeding the text we hear Job making this confession, "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither;" and this confession teaches us that, though Job was at one time so wealthy and rich in oxen, sheep, camels, asses, children, men-servants, and maid-servants, and so forth, yet that he possessed none of all these things when he was born, and that he came into the world like all others, a poor, destitute, helpless child. And notwithstanding that, he was at one time in after years abounding in all manner of the oriental riches, and luxuries of his time before this sad calamity befell him, yet he was not ashamed to confess that all he had were received from the Lord, as free gifts out of His own sovereign will and pleasure, and therefore that the Lord also had a right to recall them whenever it seemed good unto himself.

It might be that Job had been in his younger days a labourious, careful thrifty man of business, that not only he could increase his fortune, but having done so, he could also take care of his property, and not to spend it foolishly in riot and surfeit, and so it is possible that, after many years of incessant care and labour, his fortune had so increased, and that his wealth had so accumulated, as to cause him to be accounted "the greatest man of all the men of the east," yet notwithstanding all his care and labour to increase his property, he was still ready a d willing to confess that the vast riches which he possessed were all the free and unmerited gifts of heaven, "the Lord gave."

Pride, conceit, and vain-glory do not belong to God's people, and if it should please Divine Providence to prosper the work of their hands, to lift them up from the dung-hill, and cause them to sit "upon thrones with the princes of the people," yet they never boast, but they are ever ready to confess with Hannah "the Lord maketh poor, and maketh rich, He bringeth low, and lifteth up." And so it it was here in the case of Job; he dared not, and he wished not to rob God of that heavy debt of gratitude and thankfulness which he owed unto His Divine Majesty, and therefore he openly confessed that "the Lord gave!" We read in one of the Psalms that, "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain;', and thus we are taught that men may work hard morning noon and night, yet "it is all in vain for them to rise up early, to sit up late, and eat the bread of sorrows," except the Lord be pleased to crown their endeavours with His blessing. And this Job knew; he felt and acknowledged it, publicly and unreservedly; he was not ashamed when he said, "The Lord gave."

And here let me observe that there is but very little difference between man and a beast in his entrance into the world; but if there be any difference, I am bound to confess that that difference exists in favour of the beast, and not in favour of man! For instance, what creature on earth can you find more weak, destitute, and helpless than a man, or, rather, than a little child is when he comes into the world, and there is not a creature with which I am acquainted that remains so long in that deplorably helpless state, totally unable to support or to maintain himself, as the little baby is! And in consequence of this state of long and painful helplessness, it had seemed good unto our heavenly Father to have planted that ardent anxiety, that scrupulous care, that intensely warm affection which we call *Love*, in the bosoms of human parents, which, I fear not to say, is infinitely greater than the love of the brute creation.

I appeal to you who are parents here, as to the truth of what I state, and therefore I need not go to the trouble of dwelling upon it. And again, on the other hand, I am unable to make you who are young and unmarried here to understand the sincere affection and the intensely warm feelings of parents towards their children, for nothing but experience will make you understand and appreciate it. We are accustomed in this country to say of some children, "Oh! that is a lucky child." "That child is born with a silver spoon in his mouth," or, "That child is an heir to a great estate;" "Blessed, happy child, that is!" But here we forget that, notwithstanding that child's good prospects in life, or the large estate to which he is entitled, and which he may one day have to enjoy—we forget, I say, that that child, every moment of his life, during all the helpless years of his infancy and childhood, is entirely dependent upon the charity and kindness of others, and that, were he neglected and left to himself only a very short time, he would inevitably perish; he would starve and die of want, though in the midst of plenty! And this Job knew—this he confessed and acknowledged, openly and unreservedly, when he said, "The Lord gave."

And here it may be that some of you feel disposed to ask, What did the Lord give unto Job? And does the Lord give unto others? These questions I shall answer you in the words of an

inspired Apostle. "He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things." Not a bit of bread nor a drop of water have we ever tasted but what we have freely received from the bounteous hands of God. And I would have you to bear in mind that, when He giveth He giveth gifts worthy of Himself, they are priceless and satisfying, and He also "giveth liberally, and upbraideth not." Well, then, might Job exclaim here in the text, "The Lord gave."

II. Let us consider God's seemingly hard dealing with Job, notwithstanding He had once dealt so bountifully with him, that is, "the Lord hath taken away." It is hard, no doubt, for a man to be born in poverty, and be obliged to struggle on in poverty and want all his life long; but still I should imagine it must be much easier for a man who had been born poor to be able to live in poverty, than for a man who had been born and reared up in plenty and luxury; for a man never misses what he never possessed. We have a striking instance of this in the history of the unjust steward. When that unfaithful man was about to be turned out of office, we find him absorbed for a time in private meditation and pondering over the terrible change that awaited him; and at last he was forced to give vent to his feelings in these words: "I cannot dig, and to beg I am ashamed."

A man of gentle birth, or a man who has been used to enjoy life, when he is suddenly reduced to poverty and want through some unforseen and unavoidable misfortune, has not been used to the hardships that a poor man has been accustomed to bear, and therefore his want of experience makes the change so much the more intolerable for him. And I have no doubt but that it was the terrible change which came so suddenly upon him that made the young prodigal son in the Gospel, "who had wasted his substance with riotous living" in the far country, and "who would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat," to cry out with a heavy heart and tearful eye, "How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger!"

And when we read that Job had been at one time "the greatest of all the men of the East," one could naturally conclude that he must have been used to dress well; that he had a grand mansion, costly furniture; that he kept a splendid table, which used to groan under all the delicacies of the seasons; that he kept the most agreeable, as well as the most respectable company; and that he drank of the purest and most costly wines. But, lo! here comes all of a sudden the terrible storm of adversity whose blasts sweep away all before it, and we see this great and rich man hurled down from the highest pinnacle of prosperity and happiness into the greatest depths of degradation, poverty, and want! And we read that the Lord also "smote him with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown," and that Job "took to him a potsherd to scrape himself withal, and he sat down among the ashes." And here we must bear in mind that it was not for the want of proper care and attention to business; it was not through any waste and prodigality on the part of Job that brought this sudden and terrible change upon him—oh, no! but it was the visitation of God; it was He that had ordained, or rather permitted all this to be done unto him in order to prove his integrity and uprightness of heart.

Job was cognizant of the fact that the Almighty had delivered him into the hands of Satan to do what he would with him, provided he only spared his life; and therefore, instead of saying, "the Lord gave" and *Satan* hath taken away, Job saith here, "the Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away." True it is that it was the Sabeans that had seized upon the oxen and the asses, and had taken them away, and had slain all the servants with the edge of the sword. It was true that it was a fire from heaven that had burned up and consumed all the sheep and the servants. It was true that the Chaldeans had fallen upon the camels, and carried them away, and had slain all the servants with the edge of the sword. It was only too true that a great wind from the wilderness smote the four corners of the house in which all his sons and daughters were feasting together, and buried them all beneath its ruins. But Job uttered not a word of complaint against any of these, for well he knew that all these were only instruments in the hands of Satan with the express permission of God, and that by these Satan was to prove his uprightness: hence Job still persists in saying, "the Lord hath taken away." It was the same God that had dealt so bountifully with Job at first, that had now again stripped him of all that he had; and when the Almighty gave them unto Job at first, he made no conditions with him; he never promised him that he should have to keep his riches or property for any definite period, much less that he should have them absolutely and for ever. Oh, no! and hence it was only just that God should do with his own things as seemed good unto himself, and to all this just and righteous dealing of God's Job agrees; and he confesses that in the text when he says, "the Lord hath taken away."

III. And now let us consider Job's holy resignation, devout and grateful feelings under this most distressing calamity. "Blessed be the name of the Lord." Here he bursts forth not into a furious passion like a demoniac foaming at the mouth, or a man bewildered and not knowing what to do. He did not curse God and wish to die, oh no! But he took it *seriously* and *reverently*.

He could hear the tempest roaring about him in all directions, but Job knew that his God was riding in that tempest, and that he was then "flying upon the wings of the wind," and therefore, he burst forth here to glorify and bless His Holy Name in all his mysterious dealings with Him, "Blessed be the name of the Lord."

Satan imagined that Job led such an upright and godly life, simply because the Lord had previously dealt so bountifully with him, and had, if

the Lord would only change His manner of proceeding with him, and deprive him of his worldly goods, and so reduce him to poverty and want, Job would curse Him to his face.

But it was not an "eye-service" that Job rendered unto the Lord, but he *felt* the deepest obligations to Him; his heart was full of the most sincere gratitude, he could not hide it, and so from "the fulness of his heart, his mouth spoke." And what did he speak? Well, he spoke of what he felt, he spoke of that great debt of gratitude and thankfulness which he owed unto God, "Blessed be the name of the Lord." And though he had been deprived of all he possessed, and stripped as bare and as naked as when he came into the world, yet "he sinned not, nor charged God foolishly." But quite the contrary, we see him falling upon the ground and he worshipped God. He called upon His Holy Name, he thanked and blessed it, "Blessed be the name of the Lord."

Now, we find the same grateful feelings to be possessing all the true people of God at all times, and in all ages of the world. For instance, we find the prophet Habakkuk breaking forth to bless and glorify God's Holy Name, even when he was in the very act of predicting of the terrible miseries that would befall his country and nation, in the time of the Babylonian captivity. "Although," said he, "the figtree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines, the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat, the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls; yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation." We have also another instance of this ready and cheerful resignation to the Holy Will of God in the case of St. Paul, and though "he had suffered the loss of all things" for the sake of his Heavenly Master, yet he murmured not, nor uttered any complaints, but rather we hear him say, "I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content." But holy Job went much farther than St. Paul did, for, he not only was *content* in his great poverty and sickness, but he gloried in them, and thanked God for them, "Blessed be the name of the Lord."

Now the history of Job with all his losses, poverty and sickness, is a representation of the history of thousands of God's people in all ages of the world. In other words Job was not the only "man that was born unto trouble." Oh no! But he had brothers and sisters by the millions in all ages, and in all parts of the world!

It is true, all parents do not lose all their children in one day as Job did, and it is true that all good nor bad men either do not lose all their substance, or all their property, in one day, nor are they cast on a bed of sickness, as suddenly as Job was; still there are enough of bitter dregs or nauseous sediments at the bottom of the cups of many of us, so as to harass our spirits, to vex our hearts, and cause us "to go a mourning all the day long." And when we are thus compelled to repeat this disagreeable and disgusting draught from day to day, we are indeed, at times, almost tempted to exclaim with Job, "Why died I not from the womb? Why did I not give up the ghost when I came out of the belly?" Oh! it is hard to be deprived of property, and to be reduced to poverty and want! To be hurled from a state of ease and comfort, and to be dependent on the charity of others; to be confined in a workhouse, or driven to beg our bread from door to door! Oh! it is hard to part with a dear father and mother, with an affectionate brother and sister, with a tender, loving wife, or with an only darling child, and bid them all a dreary long adieu, for ever! When we are thus so heavily pressed, we are ready, at times, to pout and fret like so many naughty children; we feel disposed to get angry with Jonah, when he said, "It is better for me to die than to live." And it was thus that Job's wife counselled him to do, that is, "to curse God and die." There are some people to be found who can bury their nearest friends and relatives without shedding a tear or heaving a sigh! Aye, and I add, there are some people to be found who can bury one another long before death and the grave! Or, if they happen to have a good legacy left them, they may for decency's sake pretend that they feel a little sorry after them, when their hearts are still as well and light as ever! It is true the dead cannot feel nor appreciate any marks of respect nor disrespect that we may shew to their poor remains; but still, for my own part, I always feel a kind of melancholy satisfaction when I find relations shewing the customary marks of respect to their departed friends, because it is a sign that they loved and valued one another in life, and therefore they are not forgotten in death. I confess there may be something unpleasant and disagreeable to the cold feelings of strangers, or to those unconnected with the departed, to hear others weep and wail about the grave. Still, "there is a time to weep," and if anything can engage the mind, soften the heart, and wring a tear out of the unaccustomed eye, it is the grave! For

> This solemn scene arrests the giddy crowd,
> Dismays the wealthy and appals the proud.

But still, when we are thus forced to part with a dear relative or a friend, we should not "sorrow even as others which have no hope," especially if we have good grounds for believing that the departed had lived an upright, God-fearing life, "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so also them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him." And though it is ordained that we thus must part with one another for a period that no one save God knows how long, and that is a matter which must naturally be very painful to the feelings, yet faith enables us to look on straight through "the valley of the shadow of death," and we behold the dawn of a glorious day breaking yonder upon "the tops of the everlasting hills."

And so, when we part on the brink of the grave with some loved one who is gone before us, we still

look forward for that glorious morning when we shall meet again and part no more. Yes, there are many on yonder wide, extensive shore, which lies beyond "the old river of death," anxiously awaiting us to join them; but they shall not wait long, for some of us will soon be there, for "we have not an abiding city here, but we look for one to come." And we know "that death is the liberator of him whom freedom cannot release, the physician of him whom medicine cannot cure, and the comforter of him whom time cannot console." Come, then, my brethren, come and away with despair, though your losses are many and grievous, and your disappointments—sad, indeed—still cry for grace to be resigned to the mysterious ways of God, and say, "Thy will be done." If we shall be finally saved through the grace and mercy of God, then we should not be over-anxious as to what may befall us here, "For I reckon," saith St. Paul, "that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." Well, "the Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C. to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. IX. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 25, 1880.

THE Bishop of Lincoln's Pastoral Letter, in another column, is deserving of the attention of all Clergymen who may be called upon to carry out the *Burials Act*, 1880. He puts a charitable and at the same time a just and wise construction on that Law which ought to satisfy the legal rights of all Dissenters to share the use of our Churchyards. It would, of course, be foolish to attempt to satisfy the claims of the political Dissenter, to whom this Act, like others of Mr. Gladstone's, will prove anything but a "message of peace." We especially commend the Bishop's eloquent and touching appeal to the Clergy and Laity for the speedy division of his huge diocese. In addition to the unanswerable arguments he urges for thus improving the machinery of the Church, we hold that the promotion of these modern endowments is one of the best means of protecting the ancient endowments and property of the Church. For surely the most specious Liberationalist will not succeed in confiscating the benefactions of living persons. All Churchmen, therefore, who desire to secure the Church's property would, we think, do well to pay a small insurance, in the shape of a donation to the *Wordsworth Memorial Fund* for the endowment of the See of Southwell.

BROAD CHURCH OR NO CHURCH.

A REVIEW OF MR. STOPFORD BROOKE'S APOLOGY FOR HIS SECESSION.

BY THE REV. W. SMITH, LATE SCHOLAR OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; CURATE OF ST. PANCRAS.

(Continued from page 609.)

3. Our next consideration is the denunciation of Imperialistic Conceptions of God. Here we confess we are in some doubt as to Mr. Brooke's exact meaning. *Imperium* means supreme power. An Imperialistic Conception of God is that which regards Him as an autocrat ruling and disposing of His empire, the universe, as seems best to His Godly wisdom. Surely there is nothing here that one should complain of if God be good. If He be not good then He is not God. And if there is no God, then it is out of place to discuss imperialistic, or any other conceptions of that which does not exist. We will assume, however, that by "God" he means what everyone who employs the term means—the living embodiment of all that the consciences of men teach them to admire or to imitate. He is Life, Wisdom, Beauty, Truth, Purity, Goodness, Justice, Strength. It is such an one that humanity craves for to be its Ruler and its King. These cravings would be unsatisfied, if, associated with Him in the government of His empire, there were any assessor one whit inferior to Him in any of His Divine attributes. The Church teaches her members to entertain such a conception of God, because it is the only reasonable one.

But in truth it would seem that the sore point is not the fact that the Church teaches her members to hold Imperialistic Conceptions of God; but the fact that in England Nonconformist ministers do not hold such a good social position as the clergy of the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church. The gaze has been misdirected as to the issue, and the cause has been blamed without sufficient consideration. Let us grant the fact that Mr. Stopford Brooke deplores. What then! The clergy are accorded a greater amount of respect than the ministers of so-called religious denominations. Should it not be accorded? It is nothing to the point to assert that Christ, and the Apostles, and their immediate successors did not occupy a high social position. The question is, ought they not to have done so? "Thou sayest that I am a King" said our Lord, with a consciousness of the dignity that should be His, and that was His by right even then. "When the Son of Man shall sit on the Throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon Twelve Thrones, judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel." Such were the words He addressed to His Apostles. "Know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and esteem them very highly in love for their works' sake." So wrote St. Paul to the members of the Church

at Thessalonica. It is beside the question to say that the clergy are not such as their prototypes were. They ought to be. The way to remedy the matter is not to degrade the office, but to improve the office-bearer. Surely it is illogical to obliterate a principle, because its present upholders are not so worthy as its first exponents.

But the question is a much deeper one than it appears to be, *prima facie*. For, if Mr. Stopford Brooke's principles be carried out to their legitimate issue, they cut at the root of the aristocratic theory in all its developments. The principle of the English constitution, like that of the Catholic Church, is one of government by the best. If Messrs. Spurgeon, Newman Hall, Dale, and the rest are to be accorded positions of honour and rank in the Catholic Church on the ground that they *assert themselves* to be worthy assessors with Paul and John; then Messrs. Bradlaugh, or Brown, or Robinson must be constituted assessors with Mr. Gladstone and Earl Granville in the Cabinet, on the ground that *they assert themselves* as worthy to hold such an office. That they are Members of Parliament is nothing to the point. Whether members or not they must be accorded the position they clamour for in the government of the realm solely on the ground of their self-assertion. If Mr. Stopford Brooke is right, then Mr. Carlyle is wrong. There ought to be no such being as a "König" (the man that "*can*"), no representative of such an ideal personage, placed at the head of a community, and embodying in his *office* those qualities which a people exalt, and to which they do voluntary homage. We must let principles drift. We must have a *polycratic* form of government,—a *democratic*, which may be, nay which must of necessity be *kakistocratic*, for it will be wanting in that one essential characteristic which is absolutely necessary to the well being of a community—*order*, it will be destitute of that virtue which can alone raise its tone and give it coherence,—I mean the highest of all the virtues—*Love*. If you do away with the aristocratic principle, the trending of the social scale ever upwards to the best—each accustoming himself to go out of himself towards or against another—all having relations with one another, and interdependent upon each other—ever aiming at what is higher than themseves by striving to be better than themselves;—and never entertaining the thought of being able to occupy the highest social positions, without the highest social merit: if you do away with all this for the sake of making each man *independent*; if you honour the *base real* in preference to the *worthy ideal*, then you induce a selfish spirit into the community, you destroy its peace, and you injure its welfare. Take away his ideal, and you shrink the man into himself. He, *as he is*, has as much right to the Kingly office as the best. *And this must ever be the case in the nation in which the King dies.*

As the Court of the "König" is the realisation and best exposition of the best system of worldly government—to be improved and reformed where abuses exist, but not to be abolished—so is the Court of King Christ, the aristocracy of the priesthood as He conceived it, the best form of Church government. Christ, His Apostles, and His priests must be the living exposition of those truths and those virtues which it lies within the province of Religion to foster and to cultivate. And to the expositors by virtue of this fact is rightly accorded the respect, which in a fully and rightly-developed society would be voluntarily and eagerly shewn.

The difference in principle between ourselves and Mr. Stopford Brooke lies here. *We* maintain the reality of an objective revelation of a state and condition of society realised in a system, to which men must adapt themselves by improving the tone of their character and their lives. This system must remain unaltered in all its features even though those to whom its maintenance has been entrusted fall at times very far short of the standard which it proposes. *Mr. Brooke* denies the fact of such objective revelation, fails to see its necessity, and maintains that there should be no system, better than can be conceived by man, ever proposed for man's acceptance. Such systems of religion as man can accept should arise subjectively from man, and modify and develop themselves as Humanity developes. The idea of the possibility of such development, we have already pointed out, is chimerical.

4. And now as to the incomprehensibility of compromise.

Let it be understood that we are not now attempting to demonstrate the unreasonableness of Mr. Brooke's own secession; but of his expressed conviction of the logical necessity for the secession of the Liberal party in the Church, to which party he, before his secession, affected to belong. "Though there are members in the Church who claim their liberty, and retain their freedom," says Mr. Brooke, "the tendency in the end is too much for them, or their position becomes untenable. You cannot wholly liberalise a Church based on authority, and to take away authority, as some would do, would not liberalise the Church, but would do away with it altogether."

Mr. Brooke would do away with the Church altogether. For he says truly enough "You cannot have a church without authority;" and he is of course not unreasonable enough to think that much practical good would result from shifting the church from one standard of reference to another:—from the Anglican to his own for instance. But if there be no church, then there is no authoritative depositary for revelation; and so no sure revelation, and no complete delineation of Christ. This, as we have already pointed out, is what Mr. Stopford Brooke's teaching all tends to: and if it be allowed, then one of the great positive ethical facts that we have already alluded to is practically disregarded.

"With regard to the greatest of all religious conceptions," continues Mr. Brooke, "the idea of a universal church—the theory of the Church of England—is not only inadequate, but contradictory. That theory excludes from the Church's fold all who do not confess her creeds, and acknowledge the Bible as infallible." Precisely! but how therefore contradictory? The confusion arises in Mr. Brooke's own mind, not by any means in the nature of the case itself. The parallel he would draw between the church's creeds and sectarian confessions is no parallel at all. For the Creeds * are mere statements of historical facts; not so much doctrine, as the bases of doctrine; not propositions to be proved, but axioms to be granted.

The case is altogether different with respect to the Thirty-nine Articles. Subscription to them is a very different thing to assenting to the creed, or declaring one's faith in the book which contains the record of the process of the Revelation of Absolute Truth, enshrined

* The Athanasian Creed so called is not a creed in the true sense of the term, as Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out.

in historic fact.* The one thing is fundamental in its character; the other provisional and conventional. The one concerns the preservation of Eternal Truth; the other the establishment of a national branch of the Church upon an economical basis. The one is essential; the other convenient. In subscribing to the articles we do not necessarily imply that we so implicitly accept every statement contained in them, as to appropriate them, and make them part of ourselves, so that henceforth they may be the regulating principle of our lives. But we do declare thereby that we accept them in such a way as to make no conscientious difference on our part with respect to them, the basis of schism; that we acknowledge the wisdom of some such bond of national conformity, and that we will agitate in no unfriendly and selfish spirit against even those doctrines contained therein that our conscience will in no wise allow us to accept.

His reference to persecution in the past is also beside the mark. *No true Catholic could have persecuted.* Persecution is opposed to Catholic principle. Branches of the Church have resorted to persecution in proportion as they have narrowed the broad basis of Catholicity. Persecutions have ever been directed not against those who repudiated that which was essential, but against those who denied that which was non-essential. This alone is sufficient to put that witness out of court at once. The implied contrast, so very much to the advantage of the former, between Mr. Stopford Brooke and those narrow-minded men of the church who persecuted, is thus seen to be beside the question altogether.

The only truly economical basis of Catholicity is the theory of the Anglican branch of the Church. Positively it is this:—An historic Christ. An objective revelation. The impossibility of becoming freed from sin without the application of an objective stimulus. Negatively it is this:—No Pope. No limit to development as a Church. No narrowing down of the basis of Catholicity. The Anglican Church differs from *all* the sects in this respect. She encourages men to develop in matters of detail, so long as they trench not on that which is fundamental. She embraces all, so long as they do not arrogantly seek to divide the body to which they belong by wilful and unlawful schism.

There is a broad line of demarcation between Mr. Stopford Brooke and the Liberal party in the Church. He denies that which is fundamental. He is wrong in his facts. The Broad Church party err not here. They accept the facts. They ask us to concede the debatability of such questions as "The Eternity of Punishment," "The Nature of the Atonement," and "The Method of Biblical exegesis." They deny not the reality of Sin, and its just Nemesis. They do not dispute the historic fact of a completed atonement through Christ; nor the real existence of a Revelation in the pages of Sacred Scripture. All this to them is authoriative, and it is so because it is in its nature *scientific.*

There may be some from among the ranks of the Liberal party in the Church who have felt an inclination to follow Mr. Brooke's example. We ask such "to give themselves pause." It in no sense follows that, because one Liberal churchman, as he deemed himself, finds himself unable to continue a member of that communion in which he has so long sheltered himself, therefore all Liberal churchmen ought to feel themselves equally bound, on the score of honesty, to follow his example. Mr. Stopford Brooke has left us, and he has professed himself glad to be free. We can appreciate his sentiments. We do not deeply deplore our loss. He has avowed his disbelief in a Christ and a Church. There can be but little common ground therefore between himself and those, who feel the absolute need of the one, and the inestimable privilege of membership with the other. We do not wish him joy in his isolation. The position he has taken up may afford him freedom, it cannot bring him rest. Fain would we hope that "restlessness may toss him to our breast" again, a wiser if a sadder man. Our present purpose however is not Mr. Brooke's conversion. Our appeal is to the Liberal party in the Church. We would remind such, and we think they will do well to give good heed to the warning—that for sinners Mr. Brooke provides no Saviour that is of any use to them,—for saints no realisable ideal of excellence, for weary and heavy laden men and women of the world no sure hope of rest, for *all* no common bond of sympathy, and no real incentive to the exercise of love.

CHRISTLESS OPTIMISM.

By the Right. Hon. and Most Rev.
LORD PLUNKET, BISHOP OF MEATH.

His Lordship read what he described as a few thoughts from an address he had delivered in Ireland. In eloquent language he reviewed and estimated the results that had followed from the glowing visions of future world-wide happiness predicted by the godless thinkers of the French Revolutions,—visions by which even such minds as Coleridge and Wordsworth were dazzled for a while. What, again, he asked, were the results of the Christless dreams of ultimate perfection, based on the assumed progress of historical evolution, that had been subsequently elaborated by German philosophers? One result of the bitter disappointment of these infidel hopes was the despairing view of life which at present paralyzed the life and disintegrated the society of Germany, the Pessimism of Schopenhaur and Hartmann, with which the Nihilism of Russia was nearly allied. Such, at least, was the view taken by Mr. Sully in his exhaustive work on Pessimism. The tragic reaction following the collapse of these revolutionary hopes and the bursting of these glittering philosophical bubbles should teach the lesson that a Christless Pessimism is a natural oscillation from a Christless

* It has been pointed out to me that, in the fourth section of my review, I seem to accept Mr. Brooke's doctrine that "the Church of England excludes from her fold all who do not acknowledge the Bible as infallible;" and that this principle, if applied, would cut away from her communion such men as Dr. Reichel, whose able sermon on Inspiration appears in the *Pulpit* concurrently with the first part of this article. Perhaps I ought to explain—though I think it may be gathered from these words of mine—"Subscription to the Articles is a very different thing to . . . . declaring one's faith in the Book which *contains the record of the process of the Revelation of absolute Truth enshrined in historic fact*"—that I refer to a *functional* and not to a literal infallibility. The Church of England declares that "Holy Scripture *contains* all things necessary to *salvation*." So far as it deals with the salvation of hamanity from sin it is infallible. If by infallible Mr. Brooke refers to a literal infallibility—to quote the words of Archdeacon Reichel, "an absolute and perfect declaration of the absolute mind of the Supreme, irrespective of the changing creeds, and of the manifold imperfections of the men by whom it was written, and to whom it was addressed"—his statement that, our Church excludes from her fold all who do not accept the Scriptures as infallible, is not strictly true.

Optimism; or, in other words, that to look for true happiness or morality, socially or politically, except as the outcome of true religion, is to raise hopes that only end in despair (hear, hear)! Applying this lesson to the forms that unbelief took in the present day, and passing by the dreams of those who advocate the revival of the spirit of the Renaissance, which he described as a fascinating dream of wild and utterly selfish, if not sensual, license, he turned to a more subtle danger to be found in the new doctrine of evolution expounded by Mr. Herbert Spencer, by the teachings of which, to use the words of Mr. Sully, "the modern mind has become habituated in anticipating an indefinite expansion of human capacity in the future." This form of Optimism was less bare-faced than its predecessors; its votaries were not requested to ignore the idea of a God, though some did so, and others expressed their Theism in unsubstantial phrases. Nor did their teaching exclude the elements of a so-called morality, its adherents seeming to be nervously anxious to protest that they do believe in virtue, and taking pains to show that a conscience can in time be evolved by the same laws that produce a jelly-fish or a fungus (laughter). This was a bold theory and high sounding aspiration, but the wrecks of many such strewed the history of the past, and we might well pause with doubt before we base our hopes of a Millennium on such. Appealing to common sense, was past experience such as to warrant the expectation that out of this a culmination of perfect bliss and virtue could be brought about by the process known as the survival of the fittest, or, in other words, the survival of the strongest? With the proclamation under the French Revolution of the doctrine of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, the so-called social and political barriers of Progress were swept away; but what was the survival? Napoleon Bonaparte. Was this a triumph of morality? And what guarantee was there that history would not repeat itself (hear, hear)? The position of Christianity towards its censors reminded him of the position of a Government towards the Opposition by which it is assailed. He did not refer to any particular Government, for in the transitional phase of our politics many scarcely knew to which party they belonged (a laugh). The position of those charged with the responsibilities of office differed from that of their opponents in that their policy could not be dangled before the eyes of the nation in vague and fascinating generalities; it must be seen in practical operation. On the other hand, the Opposition had the luxury of indulging in criticising and promising. They conjured up splendid visions—sincerely, no doubt; for it was the nature, and almost the duty, of an Opposition to be hopeful—(cheers and laughter)—of what they could and would do with the reins of power. At last these fine visions come to be believed in, the Opposition becomes the Government, and these fine theories are subjected to test (cheers). Then the bubble bursts, and men again begin to learn the old old story—that the magnificence of the unknown and the untried may turn out a very sorry thing at its best (cheers). Then, turning to the analogy in a more serious light, and regarding Christianity as being now in office, and this new philosophy in the position of Opposition, he placed before the meeting a picture of the new philosophy placed in office and Christianity altogether rejected—its churches closed, its schools broken up, the ignorant and outcast no longer cared for by the pastor, all Christian work at a standstill, the voice of prayer and praise silenced, the Bible banished from heart and home; and he asked them to try and realise the dark and joyless blank. He asked them to imagine the new philosophical teachers installed in office—teachers not like those of the present day, whose early Christian education had left a lingering savour in their hearts—but men Christless from their cradle. Hear these teachers inviting their hearers to the frigid ceremonies of Positivism, and urging men to love and worship an impersonal Force, a something they can only describe as not "*Him*" but "*It;*" imagine all the well-phrased theories of fashionable magazines put to the test; what would be the result? He had in his mind the wondrous opening passage in Mendelssohn's "Elijah," representing the despair of a whole people perishing from thirst, at first a sullen, restless murmuring, gathering accumulative strength until it bursts forth appallingly in cries of heart-rending agony (cheers). Such would be the voice of a deceived and terror-stricken humanity, vainly seeking to slake its thirst at the dry wells of modern Positivism, and sending upwards at last to heaven the broken-hearted cry, "Give us back the Christ that we have lost! Away with the ghastly spectre, the hideous phantom, the 'It' that has usurped 'His' throne, and let us learn again to love and worship a God who is heart to heart" (loud applause)!

———:o:———

The Bishop of Lincoln has addressed the following Pastoral Letter to his clergy:—

Riseholme, Lincoln,
November 23, 1880.

Rev. and Dear Brethren,

Let me invite your attention to the following subjects:—

BURIAL LAWS AMENDMENT ACT, 1880.

In order to ascertain the opinions of the Clergy on several questions arising from this Act, I convened a Meeting of Archdeacons and Rural Deans of the Diocese, and of the Canons-residentiary and Non-residentiary of the Cathedral Church. This meeting was held on Friday, October 22nd. I announced to the meeting, that after careful consideration, and after taking legal advice, I was resolved not to consecrate any portions of Cemeteries, or additions to Churchyards, subject to the operation of that Act.

My reasons for this resolution have been stated in a printed letter dated October 18th last, from which I make the following extracts:—I regard Consecration as a solemn religious act. By it, in the case of a Graveyard, the land is separated from all other uses, and is set apart as a sacred gift to Almighty God. By that Act He becomes the owner of it. It is "God's Acre." Hitherto, under the Cemetery Acts, a Bishop was empowered by Law to Consecrate a portion of a Cemetery; such portion being reserved under the provisions of those Acts for "interments according to the rites of the Church of England," and it was expressly provided that such portion should "be *used only* for burials according to *those rites*" (10 and 11 Vict., c. 65, sect. 23). Another portion of the ground was, by those Acts, to be left unconsecrated for other interments. But *those Acts* have now been *virtually repealed* by the "Burial Laws Amendment Act." *No part of any Cemetery can now be reserved for Burials "according to the rites of the Church of England."* Every part of every Cemetery is free and open for all burials alike, performed by any minister or member—man or woman—of any denomination calling itself Christian.

I should be sorry to give offence to anyone. But, while I am bound to declare that Consecration, per-

formed by a Bishop of the Church of England, is a solemn religious act, in which a portion of land is dedicated to Almighty God for His honour and service, according to a certain form of doctrine and worship received by the Church of England, I am no less constrained to say that false doctrine and heresy are condemned by Almighty God in His holy Word, especially such false doctrine and heresy as denies the Godhead of Christ (2 John 10, 11; 2 Pet. ii. 1), and by consequence rejects the faith in the Ever-Blessed Trinity, in Whose Name every Baptism in the Church of England is administered; and that wilful Schism is also declared in that Word to be a grievious sin, a work of the carnal mind (1 Cor. iii. 3-5), and that "to be carnally-minded is death" (Rom. viii 6).

I cannot therefore suppose that I should be doing an act well-pleasing to God if I were to profess to offer to Him, by Consecration, a portion of land, which, soon after its Consecration, may be used for services and for addresses, by persons who deny, and teach others to deny, Christ's Godhead and the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, to say nothing of other dangerous errors, and who not only deprave the Church by heresy, but rend it asunder by schism. I could not venture to dedicate to God what may be thus desecrated on the next day after Consecration.

I do not believe that there is any Church in Christendom, guiding itself by Ecclesiastical Law and usage, which would empower and authorise a Bishop to consecrate a Burial-ground under the conditions now imposed on such places in England by the "Burial Laws Amendment Act of 1880." Let me refer to one Church. In a text-book of the Gallican Church—the Church of Bossuet and Fénélon—I find it said that wherever ground is used for the burial of persons of various sects and heresies, calling themselves Christian, there the *Church cannot consecrate such ground.* It would be contrary to her conscience to do so. The Consecration of a Burial-ground in which not only the members of all religious sects calling themselves Christian (of which there are about one hundred and thirty in England) may be interred promiscuously, but also in which the ministers and members of every such sect may *officiate indiscriminately* would, I venture to think, be *a consecration of the principle of religious indifference.*

Besides, this question ought to be argued on the principles of honesty and justice. Since the passing of the "Burials Act" *every part of every Cemetery*, new or old, belongs as much to our *Nonconformist brethren as it does to the Church of England.* Some Nonconformists have a conscientious scruple *against Consecration.* They regard it not only as an idle and unmeaning thing, but as a superstitious ceremony. What right has a Bishop, let me ask, to go and perform a ceremony—the ceremony of Consecration—which many call "a relic of Romish mummery;" and to perform it in ground which belongs as much to them as it does to the Church? If he were to do so, might not some of them perhaps meet him at the gate of the Cemetery and warn him off the ground? Might they not perhaps forbid him to commit an act of trespass upon it in the name of religion? I have no wish to do what seems scarcely fair; or to come to a place and be allowed to consecrate it only on sufferance; or to run the risk of being censured for an act of Episcopal aggression.

In some foreign countries, as is well known, in burial-places which *are not consecrated*, the Parish Priest, commissioned by the Bishop, uses a form of *Benediction over every several grave* at the time of interment. I am advised by the Chancellor of this Diocese that it would be competent for a Bishop of a Diocese in England to frame and sanction such a form for use in such places in his own Diocese. The form of "*Consecration*" which has hitherto been used in Churchyards and Cemeteries in England, may differ in different Dioceses; and rests solely on the Bishop's authority, and not on that of Convocation or Parliament. I am informed that it would be equally in his power to frame and authorise a form of *Benediction* such as I have now described; and inasmuch as such form of Benediction would only be used over a grave in a Burial-ground that has *not been consecrated*, it might be legally introduced into the Burial Service of the Church of England at the grave; as prayers, authorised by the Bishop, are now introduced into *Morning Prayer in a church just before it is consecrated.* I purpose therefore to authorise a form of Benediction for use in such cases in this Diocese. It may be as well to add, that burial-places may still be *vested in Trustees* for interments according to the rites of the Church of England, and such burial-places would be Consecrated.

At the same Meeting, I was requested to communicate with all the Rural Deans of the Diocese, and to desire them to take counsel with their respective Ruridecanal Chapters, so that every Clergyman in the Diocese might have an opportunity of expressing his opinion on certain points, and to report to me the result. I have now received returns from almost all the Rural Deaneries, and am enabled, after having ascertained the opinions of the Clergy, and after weighing them well, to declare my own judgment on the several questions proposed to them.

1. *Funerals on Sundays* are to be discouraged; and only to be allowed in exceptional cases, and for special and urgent reasons.

2. The *tolling of the bell* of the Parish Church is not to be allowed at such burials as are to take place in *Churchyards*, and are not to be conducted by the Clergy with the Services of the Church. I have restricted the prohibition to funerals in *Churchyards*, because I observe in one Deanery, in a large town, there is a general concurrence of the Clergy in favour of conceding the use of the bell in all cases; but this is where the funerals do *not* take place in a *Churchyard*, but in a *Cemetery* or *Cemeteries* distant from the Church. The fact seems to be, that, waiving the questions arising from the Canons of 1603, Canons 67 and 88 (Phillimore, p. 1756), which contemplated only such Services as those of the Church of England, it is unhappily too evident that a great danger to which she is now exposed is this, that, her *Churchyards* having been thrown open to different religious services, her *Churches* may also be diverted from the holy uses to which they have long been dedicated, and be given up to all who desire to hold their services in them, whatever those services may be. The belfries of many of our Churches are only accessible through the Church itself, and unseemly strifes may occur if, when the Church is once opened for the tolling of the bell at a funeral, it is not allowed to remain open for the performance of the funeral service within it. And when funeral services, other than those of the Church of England, are allowed to be performed in our Churches, it does not require much foresight to perceive that a claim will be soon set up for the performance of other services in them. We shall never, I hope, be provoked by a sense of wrong to give way to other feelings than those of Christian charity in matters like these. But we must also remember that we owe piety and reverence to God, and to holy things and places, as well as charity to men; and also that we owe

a debt of charity, not only to our dissenting brethren, but also to the members of the Church, especially to those entrusted to our spiritual charge; and that it is not charity to our people, nor even is it charity to dissenters, to betray what we have received as a solemn trust, and what we ought to defend. It is not charity to tempt anyone to imagine that unity in the truth is not prescribed by God, or that schism and false doctrine are not displeasing to Him. It is not charity to flatter some in sin, and to discourage others who desire to hold the truth, and who look to us for help and guidance to do so. On the whole therefore I hope that the Clergy of the Diocese will unite in giving effect to that which is the opinion of the great majority of their brethren, and in not allowing the use of the Church Bell for Funerals in a Churchyard other than those conducted by the Clergy.

3. I concur fully in the almost unanimous opinion of the Clergy that all burials should be registered by the Minister in charge of the Parish, and I would recommend the adoption of a certain form of registration of burials, other than those solemnized by a Clergyman.

4. The opinions of the Clergy vary considerably as to the application of Sect. nine. On the whole I incline to the opinion of those who think that what the Act gives to Parishioners should not be denied to Non-Parishioners whose relatives are buried in the Churchyard. But inasmuch as the Churchyard is the freehold of the Clergyman in trust for the Parishioners, and inasmuch as the Parishioners, who are members of the Church of England, have alone contributed to the acquisition, and also still contribute to the maintenance, of the Churchyard, I do not think that they who contribute nothing to it, and whose free access to it might soon fill the Churchyard, and thus cause inconvenience and expense to the Parishioners, ought to be allowed an unrestricted use of the Churchyard, and, therefore, I would limit the use of it to those Non-Parishioners whose relatives are buried in it.

ON THE OBSERVANCE OF ROGATION DAYS AND ASCENSION DAY.

The present depressed state of the agricultural interest in this Diocese, and throughout England, leads us to raise our eyes upwards and to seek for help by prayer. This distress may be regarded as a Divine Visitation designed by Almighty God to call us to examine ourselves and to humble ourselves before Him, and to confess our sins and the sins of our Country to Him, and to amend our lives and to pray to Him for mercy and blessings spiritual and temporal; and the Church having appointed certain days called *Rogation days* (viz., the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Ascension Day) for supplication to Almighty God, and for the deprecation of Divine Judgments, and for intercession on behalf of the Church and Realm, I would earnestly desire you to make the best use you can of this appointment and opportunity. I would suggest that in their Sermons on the Sunday before Ascension Day the Clergy should call the attention of their congregations to this subject, and should direct their thoughts to our glorified Lord and King, to whom all power in heaven and earth is given, our Great High Priest in Heaven, Who ever liveth to make intercession for us. . . . Let me take this opportunity of thanking you for your ready compliance with the wish expressed by me in a former Pastoral Letter for the better observance of Ascension Day, which I trust is now generally kept, with Divine Service, Sermon, and Holy Communion, in almost all Parishes of the Diocese.

PROPOSED NEW SEE OF SOUTHWELL.

1. The *Diocese of Lincoln* is the largest in territorial area among all the Dioceses of England and Wales. It is in extent more than two millions and a quarter of a million of acres, and consists of the two Counties of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, and contains more than 800 Benefices, and more than 1,000 Clergy. It therefore *ought to be divided.*

2. The *County of Lincoln*, extending over more than a million and three-quaters of a million of acres, and containing about 600 Benefices, and more than 700 Clergy, *is quite sufficient to form a separate Diocese.*

3. The population of the County of Nottingham has *nearly trebled itself* since the year 1801, and is rapidly increasing; and the population of the County of Derby has also nearly *trebled itself* since the year 1801, and is likewise rapidly increasing; and the united population of these two Counties will probably soon be nearly a *million of souls.* These two Counties therefore would amply suffice to form a separate Diocese.

4. The Dioceses of Lincoln and Lichfield have no prospect of being relieved except by the union of the Counties of Nottingham and Derby in one Diocese with an Episcopal See at Southwell with independent Episcopal authority, jurisdiction, and patronage, and this union has received the sanction of the Legislature.

5. Southwell, with its ancient Episcopal Palace, and other Ecclesiastical buildings, especially its noble Collegiate Church, with its interesting Christian associations and traditions, of twelve hundred years, and formerly the Mother Church of Nottinghamshire, has strong claims to be the See of the new Diocese. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, in whom the property of the suspended prebends or canonries is vested, are restoring the Church at Southwell, which will ere long, be equal in grandeur and beauty to most English Cathedrals.

6. This is not a personal question. More than twenty-five years ago my predecessor in the See of Lincoln, in the prime of life and vigour, stated in a letter to the Cathedral Commissioners his opinion that the Episcopal work of the Diocese was too great for any one man, and that it ought to be divided, with a new See at Southwell. It is not neccssary for me to say that his successor, in his 74th year, is quite unequal to the physical exertion required of a Bishop of Lincoln, even with the valuable help of a Suffragan. But he does not mention this for his own sake,—except with a view of asking your indulgence and forbearance—but for that of the Diocese. He pleads on its behalf with the Clergy and Laity; and earnestly entreats them to co-operate in a work which will confer great good on the two Dioceses of Lichfield and Lincoln, and thus promote the divine glory and the welfare of immortal souls.

Earnestly asking for the help of your prayers, and heartily commending you and your Parishes to the blessing of Almighty God,

I am, Rev. and Dear Brethren,

Yours affectionately,

C. LINCOLN.

P.S.—The sum now required for the endowment of the new See at Southwell is about £36,000, The building and grounds, for the residence of the future Bishop, have been provided by the generosity of the Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham, who has purchased the ancient Archiepiscopal Palace at Southwell for this purpose.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 032513811